

702

THE
REVIEWER REVIEWED:

OR, A REPLY TO THE
REV. MR. RICHARDS'S REVIEW
OF
STRICTURES on INFANT BAPTISM,

In the Course of which
SOME THOUGHTS ARE DELIVERED ON
Mr. Wilfon's Scripture Manual.

By J O H N C A R T E R,
AUTHOR OF THOSE STRICTURES.

—“ *She (viz, Lydia) was baptized and her household.*”

Acts 16. 15.

“ *And he took them the same hour of the night and washed their
stripes; and was baptized, he and ALL HIS straightway.*”

Acts 16. 33.

“ *Pædobaptismum in usu fuisse constat ex continua praxi Ecclesiae.*”

Turretini Compend. Theol. p. 251.

—“ *Siquidem nullus est scriptor tam vetustus qui non ejus
originem [nempe Baptismi Infantum] ad APOSTOLORUM SECULUM
pro certo referat.*”

Calvini Institut. lib. 4. cap. 16. § 8.

N O R W I C H:

PRINTED BY JOHN CROUSE, AND SOLD BY M. BOOTH, IN THE
MARKET-PLACE: AND BY THE AUTHOR.



DEDICATION.

To the Congregation of PROTESTANT
DISSENTERS *assembling at Mattishall,*
in NORFOLK.

Much respected Brethren and Friends,

SINCE the time you unanimously called me to labour amongst you in the gospel, I hope that, under a sense of its importance, I have endeavoured to discharge that trust, so far as I have been able, with christian fidelity. Knowing it my duty to “watch for your souls as one who must give an account,” it has been my constant care, in all my public ministrations, to dwell on those things which the scriptures represent as of the highest concern to the souls of men. I have, therefore, never studiously dwelt on subjects of debate, unless those subjects have appeared to me of high moment;

ment; yet, when pursuing the course of our labours, matters of controversy have fallen in our way, we have not turned aside, as if afraid to meet them with all their force, nor so handled them as to create suspicion, that in the things of God we respected any man's person. We desire to emulate the apostle's practice, 2 Cor. iv. 1, 2. About fifteen months ago, at the request of some amongst you, I published a discourse on the same subject here contended for. That discourse has been examined by one on the other side the question, and, you have now an opportunity to see the Reviewer Reviewed. If that Gentleman (as some of you think) has not used us altogether in so *brotherly* a way as could have been wished, and might (all things considered) have been expected, that is no reason but you should attend to the weight of his arguments, what weight you may perceive. We call you not to follow Infant Baptism *because* we embrace it. You were never wont to hear from us that "Ignorance is the mother of Devotion." No, I should be loth to see you such an uncomely progeny, and, in that case, could not love to be with you, poor as my labours may be,

be, and however unworthy of respect; yet, of their acceptableness I have no cause to complain, and for their growing usefulness I desire, as I doubt not but you also do, still to pray. With your Bible in your hands maintain the *whole* of your religious profession, and “by well doing put to silence” all that would calumniate your christian character. “*And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them that are sanctified,*” desiring to be found, not only your affectionate, but likewise

Your faithful Pastor,

Mattisball,
April 20, 1781.

JOHN CARTER.

he, and however unworthy of
yet, of their acceptance. I have
tried to explain, and to show
the things I believe as I believe
you will do, but to put it in
Bible in your hands, and to show
of your religious protection, and to
well doing but to show all that would
columns of the Bible, and to show
now, because I believe that the
to the world of the great, and to show
build your up, and to give you a
among all those that are faithful, and
ing to be found, not only in the
are, but in the Bible, and in the

Your faithful
M. J. M.
JOHN CARTER
April 20, 1831



P R E F A C E.

IT is a complaint of long standing, and generally too well founded, that subjects of controversy are commonly handled with so much acrimony that they look more like personal attacks than an earnest desire to find out truth; though it is certain this is the only motive that ought to influence polemical writers:---- All besides being only a kind of insult offered to the public at large, or to an antagonist in particular, upon whom it is determined to pour abuse, or contempt. —When this is the case, an author's meaning, though plain, is often mistaken, either wilfully, or by reason of that mist of darkness which strong prejudices cast before the eyes of his opponent. —Other things are laughed away with a jeer, and declamation is substituted in the place of argument. How glaringly this is the case, in a late review, it is sufficient only to intimate. Such things

things I never expected from such a quarter, apprehending it impossible for *that Gentleman* to stoop *so low*——And as I very well know *such* a way of treating an opponent, or arguing for a darling tenet, can never be approved, except by a few individuals who are devoured by prejudice, I should most willingly pass *all that part* over, with the contempt it deserves, and take no further notice of it. But, as my opponent is reported to have answered *every argument* in my little pamphlet, I therefore, thought myself under some necessity of following him; though not in his spirit, yet, in his work, more particularly than otherwise I should have done; this, of course, has obliged me to mention some of his *disagreeables* much oftener than I had any inclination to do; yet, as I have been careful not to render “railing for railing,” I hope this will be a sufficient apology in the eye of a discerning few, into whose hands these papers may fall. As to others, I neither fear their envy, nor court their applause.——The following work is designed more immediately for the use of those people under my particular charge, and for such as may not have

have it in their power to enter into a laborious search of the subject under debate. The Author means it, as he did the former, as an apology for his own conduct in baptizing Infants, and hopes it will appear he has better reasons for doing it than the “Papiſts have to pray for the dead*.”——Mr. Richards thought proper to ſend forth in company with his own, a treatiſe of the Rev. Mr. S. Wilſon’s, for what reaſons he beſt knows. He has told us who he was, and ſubmitted the mode of his enquiry, and the juſtneſs of his determination to our peruſal. And, indeed, we cannot but obſerve a very ſtriking difference between his mode of language and that of our Reviewers.——Had it been in the ſame ſtrain we ſhould have paſſed him by without the leaſt notice. But ’tis with pleaſure we behold that a perſon who was once of our ſentiments, and afterwards went over to our opponents, was ſo well inſtructed in the principles of good manners, that he never forſook them all his days!——On whom this reflects honor we will not ſay. ’Tis rather unhappy, I think,

* See Review, page 36.

think, for my opponent that he should publish a piece with his own which is so directly in contrast, as to a certain particular!—Though I approve of Mr. Wilson's *manner of speech*, yet, as I cannot fall in with *his mode of argument*, I have in some places shewn my objections, whether to the advantage of our cause or not others must determine. The subject of the following pages is cast into six chapters, the titles of which are accompanied with a summary account of the things therein argued, which renders it unnecessary for us here to rehearse them. The whole is committed, by the author, to the reader's candid perusal, and the “ blessing of him who worketh all in all.”

J. C.

THE



T H E

REVIEWER REVIEWED, &c.

C H A P. I.

Strictures on the Reviewer's mode of argument. Vindication of his opponent from the charges brought against him. Pleading guilty as to one instance alleged. The author's desire that the weapons of his warfare should not appear carnal.

WHEN the Author of "Short Strictures on Infant Baptism" sent his little pamphlet into the world, he hoped that he should offend no man, who differed from him in that particular sentiment. Living in a country where freedom of debate, and the liberty of the press, are the glorious bulwarks of many valuable privileges, civil and sacred,

C

cred, he knew he had a right to publish his thoughts upon a subject he deemed interesting; and thought it his duty in reference to those who urged their request. Mr. Richards had an undoubted right to examine his little production with the severity of a critic, and he was welcome too, to think as *little* of it as he pleased. But whereas he thought good to review that pamphlet, and to present the public with his thoughts upon it, I must confess myself surprized at the manner in which he has done it. From *him* I looked for other things. He has, most certainly, a right to judge for himself; I have the same; and our neighbour's claim is as good as either of ours. A little more candor might have done his cause no harm. I am inclined to believe that by-standers will think so. Pity when he makes such an outcry against *infallibility* that he should lay such a claim to the privilege in his own person--- With such people I never could persuade myself to rank Mr. Richards, and am sorry to find he claims kindred with such kind of folks; that he does so, dispassionate people will, perhaps, think as well as myself, when they hear him roundly say

say " It is my firm opinion, that sermons on Infant Baptism, and on some other popular subjects, would look much better without any thing at all from scripture, either for a text* or for any other purpose — It will be quite sufficient if preachers take their text from the Bible, and make use of the inspired writings, by way of proof and illustration, when their subjects happen to be scriptural ones†." To be sure this is pretty dogmatical, yet for all that, it may, with some people, pass off with an eclat ! We are also told by this learned gentleman that, exorcisms, using the sign of the cross—together with a number of other idle trumperies—serve at this day, *along with Infant Baptism*, to decorate that Mother of Harlots the Romish church, and to excite the childish admiration of its ignorant and furious votaries‡." — Who then could have ever thought that amongst the advocates for Infant Baptism there should

C 2

have

* If there is *no text* in the Bible which would have suited such a subject as Mr. Richards affirms, he, of all people had no cause to complain for the want of one in my discourse.

† Review b. 7.

‡ Page 4.

have been found men who were " Critics of the first rank ?" But, that this is the case, we are not allowed even to doubt, our Author himself being judge (p. 9). Perhaps the mystery lies here. When these great men argue for Infant Baptism, they are to be ranked in company with the ignorant and furious votaries of the church of Rome ; but when speaking on the mode of Baptism they contend for immersion, then the honorable appellation of " Great Critics" is conferred upon them, for a reason too obvious to name. But, if these were *honest* men, as well as great critics, surely they would never have argued for Infant Baptism, on the footing of *Divine authority*, unless they had found it in the *scriptures* ? After commending this venerable list of worthies, therefore, it was not quite modest in our author to affirm (p. 28) that " The Papists, when they plead for the supremacy of the Pope, and the infallibility of their church, from the High Priesthood and the infallibility of the Mosaic dispensations, have *full as much* plausibility and *reason* on *their* side, as the *Pedobaptists* have when they argue from the Abrahamic covenant and circumcision in favor of Infant Baptism."

After

After this specimen of our Reviewer's ability at bold assertions, it can be no surprise that he should turn away with evident marks of contempt, from such a declaration as he found in our short *Strictures* "That Baptism may be of much profit to children every way," passing it over, "As coming under the *same description* with the pleas of the church of England in favor of sponsors and the sign of the cross; and those of the church of Rome in favor of invocations to the saints, praying for the dead, for the souls in purgatory, &c. p. 36, all which *fooleries* have this plea of profitableness made in their behalf, as well as Mr. Carter's favorite usage, Infant Baptism——And with EQUAL PLAUSIBILITY!!! How *easy*, but at the same time, how *mean*, are such replys! I only say, if *such* arguments are decisive, be *convinced who will*.——As our Reviewer's performance will, most likely, fall into the hands of those who have not previously read our "*Short Strictures*," such people will very probably think that our little pamphlet abounds with illiberal reflexions on our opponents. Whoever may think so, there can be no vanity in requesting them to
read

read and judge for themselves. Mr. Carter I observe, says my opponent, would be thought to have used us well in this publication, and, seemingly, prides himself in the thought of having done so, as if that had not been *his duty*" (p. 5)—— So then, what is duty for Mr. C—— is not for Richards!——I thought, till now, 'twas the duty of *both parties alike* to use each other well. But I know my judgment is not infallible!——I meant, indeed, to use my opponents so as to preclude all just cause of complaint, but it seems my antagonist thinks I did not, for in the advertisement prefixed to the pamphlet, these words are found written. The author professes, " He can with pleasure say, that he hath the happiness to know, and honor to be acquainted with some of a different opinion, whose persons he esteems and whose characters he greatly regards." I appeal to the candid and impartial. What, but a purpose to misinterpret, could ever have induced any person to explain these words, in an unfavourable light? Although Mr. R---- will not positively assert that the writer intended any thing disrespectful, yet he says "'tis *difficult* to see how the words
can

can bear any *other sense*," (p. 5 and 6)---
 A *little* of that charity which hopeth all things, would have helped him and his friend out of this dilemma.——Those words of the author, it seems, have been construed as implying, 1. That among the several Baptists he knows there are but few whose persons and characters are lovely and respectable. Therefore, 2. That it is a rare thing to find among those people many that answer to that description*.——I can make no excuse for them but by supposing that when they read the passage they fancied the word *some* was printed in *Italics*; and for this surmise I am indebted to Mr. R—— who has so printed it in his Review; had I done in like manner they would have had some *colourable* pretence for their construction. But, as that was not the case, I can't conceive from what it should originate, unless the power of *prejudice*, or a *sense of guilt*.——Does not all the world know that there are some amongst all religious denominations who reflect no honor upon their party? And will the Baptists be hardy enough to plead an exemption? Could I have said *more* had I spoken of *any other people*? What room then for exception?

ception? I have only to add, that amongst those to whom I bore that *undissembled* testimony of my respect, Mr. Richards himself was second to none. I may do this, perhaps, if not with more confidence, yet, with a better grace as it is a circumstance well known, to some of his friends, as well as mine. At this kind of treatment, therefore, it may be no wonder if I express not only my surprise but the utmost astonishment!—But I must not expect to come off thus, a second accusation is preferred against me; in respect to which, however, I should find no great difficulty in pleading guilty, provided the charges were not laid *so high*; in a moment of unguarded vanity, I suffered the following expression to drop from my pen “It ought not to be wondered at if men at a dead list should call any where for help”——I own (and am not ashamed to confess) that this carries in it a little too much the air of self-importance, and therefore, however it might suit, was *wrong* in *me*. But, when I am told that “These words can by no means harmonize with an intention to give no offence; though they may very well suit the purpose of one whose aim is more to
misrepre-

misrepresent and *provoke* than fairly to confute his antagonist." I can by no means think the author pronounces the sentence of a just judge; and therefore from him I appeal to the tribunal of the impartial, where I have no fear that the damages will be laid higher, than I have rated them.—But lo! a third charge is brought forward. My Reviewer informs the public that "Many such unfriendly expressions are to be met with in the course of this work, especially in the third part where the author makes such a shocking havock among our objections*."

—An enquiry into the nature of that havock we shall reserve to a more proper place. In the mean time we cheerfully leave it to every candid person to decide, who has written, in the most friendly manner, on the subject—There is one instance, however, that our antagonist singles out as a specimen of the havock made among their objections, that may not improperly be taken notice of here. It seems the author had stated one of their *objections* against Infant Baptism in the following manner; "What benefit can it be to children who are incapable to un-
D
derstand

derstand what is done or meant thereby?" This is found fault with. He does not deny it to be an objection, but, "At best 'tis no common objection of ours" says Mr. R——. "Some old woman (continues he) perchance may have used something of this sort."——If our opponent would be content to rank those with old women, whom I could name, as having used this very objection, I fancy some of his brethren would not be highly pleased with the compliment. But, we must know, that gentleman is not always scrupulously attentive to politeness. Let his own words speak for him. "I must here observe (says he) that our author has stated this objection, like the former, in a very unfair and *slovenly* manner" (p. 34) ——His author, though no adept in gentility, yet, has the vanity to think that he never set the example of ill manners before any; and is pretty confident he never did before Mr. Richards; if, therefore, he was determined to pour contempt upon his opponent, he might have been satisfied to have done it in a *cleaner* language; *some* people think it would have been more decent, and *all* must allow it would have been *full as convincing*.---We
sha

shall now dismiss this chapter of *disagreeables*, not indeed for want of matter, that is not the case, (for several other instances might be adduced) but, because it is no pleasure to us to waste our time in such sorry business. We hoped also that a certain person had been of the same mind. It was our desire, and still is, that whether the “Weapons of our warfare” were allowed to be “mighty” or not, they, at least, should not appear carnal.

C H A P. II.

On the Mode of administering the ordinance of Baptism. Or an Enquiry whether Dipping is essentially necessary in christian Baptism.

THE author of “*Strictures on Infant Baptism*” when speaking on that part of the subject now before us, was not ashamed to own, nor afraid to declare, that had this only been the matter of debate he should scarcely have deemed it worth an hour’s contention.—He pro-

fesses himself to be still of the same mind, and that because he is truly satisfied, that a partial application of water to the body, by pouring, washing, &c. sufficiently answers to scripture representations in this case. Yet, though such are *his sentiments* he would by no means be *angry* with those, who judging immersion the more proper way, follow the conviction of their own minds. But this, it seems, is not enough for my antagonist. He must be allowed something more than the liberty to think for himself, or his opponent shall not escape his censure. (see page 15.) However, his censure, in this case does not much trouble or affect us; for although we allow "That they who practise Baptism by immersion, are by no means to be condemned on that account," yet we likewise believe that considering how *little stress* is laid on what is *merely ceremonial* and *circumstantial* in the christian dispensation, considering how effectually the *main ends* of the ordinance may be secured *without immersion*, and how *weak* some of the arguments for its universal obligation are, *those* who *approve* and practise it ought at least to be *candid* towards

wards *those* who *differ* from them; and [we do also judge that they] act without sufficient warrant, if they separate from such acts of communion with them, as they might otherwise esteem proper expressions of mutual love, and of their common hope in the gospel"——* Yet to be dipped, appears a matter of so *great consequence* to our zealous advocate for immersion, that, according to *his* arguments (p. 15) it should seem almost, if not altogether, impossible to be *faithful unto death* without complying with it. This gentleman tells the public "That his opponent thinks there are some *scriptural* and *divine rites*----rites that he is fully satisfied that they are *such*; which nevertheless are of so trivial a nature as scarcely to be worth supporting for a single hour." Where, pray Sir, did you see this? Do my arguments import *any thing like it*? Did I not say I was *satisfied from the scriptures* that Baptism might be rightly performed by a partial application of water *when there was no dipping* in the case, though I allowed it *might* be administered by *immersion* to those who judged it the more proper way?——But
did

* See Dr. Doddridge's Lectures, p. 515.

did I so much as intimate that I looked upon any one of these various methods of applying water to the body to be a Divine rite exclusively and in that view, declared it of no importance? My words evince the *contrary*. Yet, strange to tell, I am chastized for letting my neighbour think as well as myself! Though I am still of opinion, he has as good a right; as I judge “Every man should be fully persuaded in his own mind.” If, therefore, after a diligent and humble search into the mind of Christ as delivered in the New Testament, any person is fully satisfied that the administration of the ordinance may be performed in a manner different from what I practise, whoever condemns him, I will not; and I humbly apprehend that our Reviewer’s zeal would have been full as much according to knowledge had he been *cool* enough to admit the *same consequence*. That Baptism is a significant ceremony, or, a rite, which bears an evident allusion to something represented by it, I make no question: But that it *primarily refers* to the *burial* and *resurrection* of Christ, I *never yet* could see sufficient evidence to *believe*; the whole tenor of the New Testament appears to me to give quite

quite another representation of it. That it is a rite expressive of *cleansing* and *purification*, seems we think very plain.—— That the *allusion* was *not* understood to refer to the *burial* and *resurrection* of Christ during the whole of *John's* ministry is certain; and 'tis no less evident that this was the case when it was administered by the *Apostles* during our Lord's abode with them.—— John baptized——The Apostles themselves were baptized, and baptized others without so much as knowing that Christ should be *buried* and *rise again*; their baptism I suppose was *valid*, and yet there was no “Recognition of the burial and resurrection of Christ*” attending it; if *this* therefore was primarily designed by it how can it be proved that baptism was rightly administered, or received all that time? Were the Apostles baptized afterwards? Who should perform it? The Baptism *they* received then was administered without their understanding any such allusion as that pleaded for by our opponents. We therefore judge that we have very great reason to think the allusion was *not* to the *burial* of Christ, but that the *principal idea* contained

* Mr. *Wilson's* expression.

tained in this New Testament rite is *cleansing* and *purification*. This a multitude of references seem to evince; and we think it ought carefully to be observed that the water which in christian baptism is applied to the body, seems plainly intended as an emblem of the Holy Spirit, in his purifying operations; and that, therefore, if we consider in *what manner* this spirit is represented in scripture as communicated or given to us, it should seem that *pouring* or *washing* with water best answers the designed allusion; for, to use the words of Dr. Guise, " This way of pouring water upon them most naturally signified Christ's baptizing them with the Holy Ghost and with fire, which John spoke of as prefigured by his baptizing *with* water (Matt. iii. 11----Mar. i. 8----Luke iii. 16----John i. 33) and which was eminently fulfilled when the Holy Ghost sat upon the Disciples in the appearance of cloven tongues, like fire; and this is expressly called baptizing them with the Holy Ghost, in opposition to John's baptizing with water, and is spoken of as the Holy Ghost's coming upon them, and as God's pouring out his spirit, and shedding him forth upon them (Acts

(Acts 1, 5, 8——2. 3, 17, 18, 33) and with a direct reference hereunto, when the Holy Ghost fell on Cornelius, and his friends, Peter said, “Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost,” (Acts 11, 15, 16.) The Apostle Paul likewise, in a manifest allusion to Baptism, speaks of God’s saving us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour (Tit. 3, 5, 6). Now whether *plunging* the body into water, or *pouring* water upon it, was the likeliest emblem of this effusion of the spirit let the reader judge*”——Our Reviewer needed not, therefore, to have expressed himself with so much astonishment “Mark! (says he) sprinkling, pouring, or washing with water! Here are two or three distinct rites either and every of which, according to this writer, to be looked upon when performed in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as the Baptism of the New Testament——*Surely* this is next to saying, that this ordinance may be administered

E nistered

* See Dr. Guise on Matt. 3.

nistered *any how*" (p. 7). Surely, Sir, this is *not* the author's meaning. He allows, indeed, that the inference *justly* deducible from his arguments amounts to this, that "Dipping is not essential to the administration of Baptism." Nor is he yet acquainted with reasons sufficient to alter his opinion, although "That remarkable expression, in the epistle to the Ephesians "One Baptism" has often occurred to him; the sense of which he would thus express; there is "One Baptism, by which we own Christ, and profess ourselves his followers, there were indeed diverse washings among the Jews; but now one Baptism only among christians*"——Where that New Testament rite, therefore, has been *once* administered, let others take care upon *what authority* they repeat it.——Repeat it Sir! (methinks I hear Mr. R—— say) why, there has been *no such thing* as *Baptism* in the world, nor *any one baptized* person for these seventeen hundred years, who was not *plunged* in water, "For when it is said that Philip baptized the Eunuch, it means, nothing less in our opinion than that he dipped him"——Well, then, to conclude the point, "Baptizing must be so"!!!——

But,

* Cradock *in loco*.

But, whereas we argued in favor of baptism without dipping, that the original terms are such as by no means *necessarily* imply a being put under the water as to the *whole body*, we shall now give our reasons more fully for that opinion; though we must first take notice of our author's exceptions, as to what we remarked concerning the Greek prepositions *En, Eis* and *Apo*, We there said, that though they are frequently rendered *in, into, and out of*, yet they might with equal propriety, and often with more justice, be translated *at, with, to, towards, from*. Upon this Mr. R—— expresses his surprise, “Often with more justice!” and adds, “Might they with more justice in the passages relative to baptism, is the question?”—Permit me, Sir, if I was really so unhappy at first in stating my thoughts that my intention could not be discerned, nor the force of my conclusion perceived; allow me, I say Sir, to attempt it now. I argue that the prepositions, under debate, are of such *indefinite* nature that there is no *necessity* to translate them *in, into, or out of*, but might with more propriety, in many instances, be rendered *at, with, from, &c.*

and are (as our zealous advocate for dipping needs not be told) really so rendered in numbers of places in the New Testament; whence I conclude, that the *original* terms, used to express the *circumstances* attending the administration of baptism, do not *necessarily* prove the *immersion* of the subject. This, I meant, and this I still think my arguments imply'd. Whether they are of any service to the cause, let others say. Mr. Richards, however, is peremptory, and asserts of his opponent that "His criticisms on the above prepositions cannot be of any service to an advocate for sprinkling, but roundly affirms that they may be of service to *Quakerism*, *Popery* and *Deism*! heavy charge indeed! Pray (methinks I hear some enquire) *how* is it supported?" "Nay my good friend that's the mystery ---Mr. R----- has not made it *appear* yet."---I argue that John and the Apostles baptized *with* water*. Hence a
Quaker

* Note, the laying any weight on its being said----
 "were baptized *in* Jordan"---shews extreme ignorance of the original. For, 1. The word [*εν*] here translated [*in*] is in no less than an hundred and fifty places of the New Testament rendered [*with*]. 2. The word [*εν*] is more than an hundred times in the New Testament
 tament

Quaker may deny the necessity of *any*, because I think it may be done *without plunging*. Indeed! Yes, “ For he may deny most of the instances of water-baptism in the New Testament.” !?—Yea more, “ *A Papist* likewise may find such learned quibbles of no small service—He may tell us that since the primitive christians went not into the water, but only towards it when they were baptized, it is very probable that they were not all baptized with water, but that many of them might be baptized with *wine, oil, or some other liquid*.” This is our author’s *plain* inference: Now let us hear his *very modest* conclusion: He adds, “ And I am *sure* a Papist will have as much reason to argue *so* as Mr. C—— has to think, “ *That our Lord went to the brink of Jordan for John to pour water upon him with his hand*” !!!——I beg leave here to observe what a certain writer has remarked, which as it evinces I am by no means singular in this my folly, so also it

tament rendered [*at*] and ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ may most justly be rendered *AT the river Jordan*; and so, the whole strength of the argument, from John’s baptizing *IN Jordan*, evaporates at once.”----See a pamphlet-entitled “ *Dipping not the only scriptural and primitive manner of Baptizing*.” page 26.

it may appear that our reasons are not quite so weak, as it pleased some people to represent. “ The *proper meaning* of the *Greek* phrase is *at Jordan*; expressing the place where John was baptizing, by way of distinction from the place, whence Christ came to be baptized of him. It is the very same phrase that is used by the *Greek* interpreters, where David tells Solomon, that *Shimei came down* to meet him *at Jordan*. Whence it appears that Christ *might go down* to Jordan, and so come *up from* the river after he was baptized by John *at Jordan*; and yet never have been so much as *in Jordan**.” However, we only argue that it *cannot* be *proved* that he was *dipped*.—Pass we on to hear our author farther advance: “ These curious sophisms (says he) are in no wise unfavorable to the cause of Infidelity.—They manifestly tend to support a charge of ambiguity and imperfection against the scriptures; and whatever does so must be exceedingly friendly to the interests of Deism.” According to this, whoever *doubts*, or *hesitates*, about *dipping* as *essential* to Baptism, must be a
friend

* Pædo-Baptism defended against Dr. Gill, part second, page 74 and 5.

friend to Deism and a support to Infidelity!!—Such is the charge brought against me in the public court; yet, heavy as it is, and notwithstanding the authority by which it is supported, I still have confidence enough to believe, that with the candid and impartial, I shall be brought in *Not Guilty*.—I do therefore cheerfully leave my cause with the public.—Mr. R——— seems a little out of humor with his opponent because he had discovered so much want of “*Candor and ingenuity*” as to insinuate that it is *by no means certain* that Philip immersed the Eunuch. Indeed he remains still of the same mind. And he should have remembered, that the arguments of his opponent there, turn upon the circumstances of administration; as his *going down into the water*, and coming up out of it, which being said as much of *Philip* as of the *Eunuch*, we concluded that these terms cannot, necessarily, signify being put *under* the water, and *so* coming up out of it according to *that notion*. I am still of opinion there is some force in the conclusion, and my opposer seems to allow it; for he says, “We do not however plead that the Eunuch was dipped merely

merely because it is said that he went into the water, but because it is added that Philip baptized him there; which in our opinion means nothing less than that he dipped him*."——Very well Sir, then the debate between us is reduced to the sense of the word Baptize, which, therefore, we shall proceed to offer some remarks upon; and it cannot be a disagreeable circumstance to our Reviewer and his friend that we profess to enquire into the meaning thereof, and establish its import principally on the *authority* of the *New Testament*; for we can't but think, with Dr. Wall, that "The sense of a scripture word is not to be taken from the use of it in secular authors, but from the use of it in the scripture. What Baptizo (to baptize) signifies among Greek writers and what interpretation Critics and Lexicons do accordingly give of it, is not much to the purpose in this case to dispute, when the sense in which it is used by the Penmen of Scripture may otherwise be plainly determined from scripture itself†." Now, if upon examination, it may

* Page 12.

† Dr. Wall's History of Infant Baptism, vol. 2d, p. 219.

may be made to appear that these sacred penmen used the word baptize whether or no there was *immersion* in the case, it can't be thought rash in us, or in any, to assert that *dipping is not essential to baptism*—That such is our opinion has been declared, and that we are not singular herein, or take up the notion without scripture precedent, the following instances shall bear witness for us; and we trust, with some, their testimony will not be hastily excepted against nor totally disregarded, if they are found to have any weight——“ The word to baptize is used simply for to wash, Mark 7, 4, whence Paul mentions diverse baptisms” (Benedic. *Pictet*. p. 928 (mihi)——“ Baptism and to baptize are used in holy scripture either properly, or in a metaphorical manner, *properly* they signify in general *any washing as well as immersion*” (Gerard, vol. 4, p. 415)----Another famous writer, whose learning is celebrated by the accurate Mons. Bayle, and whom, therefore, our opponents may allow knew something of language, says, “ The word βαπτίζεσθαι to be baptized, signifies in scripture phrase not only to be immersed, *but also to be sprinkled; to have water applied to the* subject;”

subject ; to be washed. Hen. Alting. vol. 3, p. 312. “ Bapto and Baptizo, the words from which baptism is derived, properly mean to *apply water to* any thing ; to *wash* ; a very evident example of which signification we have in Luke 11, 38. Mar. 7, 4. Heb. 9, 10*. Dr. Owen says “ *No one instance* can be given in the *scripture* wherein Baptizo doth necessarily signify either to dip or plunge, 1. It doth not signify *properly* to dip or plunge, for that in Greek is *εμβαπτω* and *εμβαπτίζω*. 2. It no where signifies to dip but as a mode of, and in order to washing. 3. It signifies, the dipping of the finger, or the *least touch* of the water, and *not plunging the whole body*. 4. It signifies also to wash, in good authors†.” — The Doctor allows, indeed, that the ancients used to baptize both grown persons and children *oftentimes* by dipping, but they affirmed it necessary to dip ’em naked, and that three times ; *but not one ever denied pouring water to be lawful.* — — Archbishop Tillotson also, one of the names which compose the list in a certain review, says, “ That the putting off their garments

* Vid. Synopsin purioris Theologiæ, p. 601.

† Dr. Owen on Infant Baptism and Dipping.

garments signified the putting off the body of sin." Serm. on 2 Tim. 2, 19. Mr. Richards should, therefore, have told us the whole that he said upon the point in the place quoted by him; but *this part* of his testimony he thought proper to omit. However, after all, I would ask, What end does his train of names answer? What support do *they* give to *his cause* who *denies Infant Baptism, which these persons* quoted by him so strenuously *argue for*? It must be owned, I think, when our opponents have made the *most* of 'em *they can*, upon *their* principles, they are but "Half converts to the right*." And whereas the quantity of water used in the ordinance is, in our view, so trifling a matter, we have still a claim to the *best half* of their testimony; which, if we were to produce in our turn, I believe some folks would not be highly pleased with it, any more than they would find it an easy matter to answer their arguments†. We go on to observe, That the

F 2

above

* Dr. Young.

† "Christ no where requireth *dipping*, but only *baptizing*; which word (as *Hesychius*, *Stephanus*, *Scapula*, and *Budeus*, the great masters of the Greek tongue, make good by very many instances and allegations out of

above passages, referred to so unanimously by the fore-cited authors, do give some countenance to the cause for which they are brought, we think may appear to men of calmness and candor who duly consider them without prepossession or prejudice. The whole passage in Mark reads thus, “ And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled (that is to say with unwashed) hands, they found fault, for the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they wash *βαπτίζονται* they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing (baptismos, *baptisms*) of cups and pots, brazen vessels and of tables,” or, as the word signifies, beds or couches. In Luke 11, 37, 38, we read, “ And as he spake, a certain Pharisee besought him to dine with him; and he went in and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it he

of classic writers) importeth no more than *ablution*, or *washing*, which may be done *without dipping*.”----Dr. Featly, author of the “ *Dippers Dipped*,” a piece which I have not seen, and am, therefore, indebted to Mr. Leigh’s *Critica Sacra* for this quotation.

he marvelled, that he had not first been washed (βαπτισθῆν baptized) before dinner" — Here we find some of the Pharisees murmuring against the disciples and against their master for the same cause, that is for eating bread with unwashen hands; so says Mark of the disciples. Luke speaking of the same thing concerning Christ, expresses it by saying they marvelled he had not been baptized, or, as our translation has it, *washed* [viz. as to his hands*] before dinner whence it seems clear, and, to us, sufficiently evident, that the sacred Penmen use the word *baptize* for any kind of *washing in general*, by no means *confining* it to the *dipping* or *immersion* of the *whole body* in water; yea, comparing Luke with Mark, it seems plain that according to their representation of this matter, a person may very properly be said to be baptized who has water applyed to a part of the body only, and consequently we may denote a person to be rightly baptized who has water poured upon his face in the administration of that sacred ordinance. — If our opponents reply that neither of the Evangelists are here speaking

* το βαπτισθῆναι idem hic declarat atque το λουεσθαι χερσιν ut diximus. Mar. 7. 4. Beza.

ing of that holy ordinance, but of the washings of the superstitious Pharisees, we grant it readily enough, but then we affirm too that in speaking of these washings the word is used by which this New Testament ordinance is expressed, and consequently we may argue from them to the mode of its administration; which is all we bring them for——Some of our opponents seeing the validity of these arguments, have in order to evade their force endeavoured to persuade themselves that the Jews *always* after coming from market, or before meat, *plunged* their whole bodies in water; but, as Dr. Wall well argues, “It is inconceivable, and an impracticable thing for men that live near a market, and have frequent occasions to go in and out, especially servants and officers of the market, who must go into it several times in a day, to undress and dip themselves as often as they eat*.” From all these things we still think that we have some appearance of reason on our side when we do not own ourselves convinced, that Baptizing must signify Dipping.——Yea, Mr. Richards’s assertion has not removed our scruples, though in concert with his northern brother,

* Dr. Wall’s Defence, page 115.

ther, he has had the — to tell us that “ Men can no more be baptized *by sprinkling* or *pouring*, than they can eat the Lord’s supper by *seeing* or *smelling**” !!! Just before this bold flourish the same writer remarks that “ The translators, in other cases, have rendered the primitive word *Bapto* by the English word *dip*, whenever it occurs in the New Testament; and had they (says he) in like manner translated it when expressive of this ordinance, every one would have known what action our Lord enjoins, when he says, baptizing them.” — Why did not Mr. Richards, or his learned friend, tell us *where* *Bapto* is used as expressive of the *ordinance of baptism* ?” — We can find *no such* place in the New Testament, any more than many who have gone before us — Dr. *Doddridge* tells us that “ *Bapto* is *never* used for Baptism,” and argues that as *Baptizo* is derived from *Bapto* “ It may in this *diminutive* form signify any method of washing†” — Dr. *Guise* speaks in concert with the above when he tells us that “ *Baptizo*, the word constantly used for baptizing, signifies any sort of washing, and

* Review, page 17.

† Dodd. Lec. page 514.

and often sprinkling ; not being restrained to dipping as its primitive (Bapto) is ; but this last word, says he, is *never used to express baptizing**." There are two more instances wherein our author has put in his exceptions against our plea, that baptism may be administered without immersion, and which we shall now take notice of. The first relates to the case of the three thousand mentioned, Acts 2:---concerning whom, our Reviewer says, with becoming modesty, that "The Baptists do not pretend to know who baptized them," and insinuates his doubts whether they were all baptized in one day or not†. I am so well pleased with this humility that I am not at all disposed to controvert *that point* any further with him, being willing to come to *his own terms* ; otherwise, I profess I should still have had my doubts, although Mr. R—— has told us that he himself did once baptize about twenty persons in less than half an hour. The other instance refers to Paul's expressions (Heb. 9, 10) *Diaphorais Baptismois* "diverse baptisms." And we cannot think our author's reasons are altogether

* Guise Paraph. on Matt. 3rd.

† Review, page 14.

gether so powerful here, as in the above case, notwithstanding he has delivered his thoughts upon the subject, in the words of a very sensible northern writer*. This gentleman tells us "The Baptisms mentioned in Heb. 9, 10. were not every kind of washing, but the diverse baptisms prescribed by the law for unclean persons" — That the apostle speaks of unclean persons in Heb. 9, we allow, but that he does so in the *tenth verse* has not yet been made evident, and we think our author should have done this before he attempted to argue as he has done upon the point, else we may ask "Whom does his arguing reprove?" But, to be sure, his method is very curious; the apostle in v. 10 speaks of diverse baptisms; — the connection, I think, shews that he has principally in view the diverse washings of the priests†, for they were persons
G who

* Review, page 10.

† "The Apostle seems to have a particular respect unto the washing of the priests, and of the offerings, in the court of the tabernacle before the altar: For these were such, as without which the gifts and sacrifices could not be rightly offered unto God," ---- Dr. Owen *in loco*.

In what manner the priests were to wash when they
went

who had to officiate in the sanctuary, in behalf of the people who offered both gifts and sacrifices, as mentioned v. 9; however at verse 13th taking notice of the unclean he specifies the manner in which their purification was performed, telling us that they were sprinkled with the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of an heifer, which is discoursed at large, Numb. 19. 17, 18.—and from this mentioning of the unclean, Mr. R---- and his associate argue that the “Baptisms spoken of at v. 10 were those prescribed for unclean persons. What necessity was there then, I ask, for those gentlemen to illustrate their commentary with the following learned criticism, taken from Lev. 4. 6, 7 “ Thus the priest shall (*Bapsei*) dip his finger in the blood, and (*Prosfra-nei*) sprinkle of the blood seven times before the Lord---before the vail of the sanctuary----and shall (*Ekchei*) pour all the blood of the bullock at the bottom of the altar of the burnt offering.” Upon reading this I could hardly forbear ex-claiming

went into the tabernacle of the congregation is expressly declared in Exod. 30. 18, 19, 20, 21----and which, therefore, ought to be noticed by the reader and compared with this disputed passage of our Apostle.

claiming in the style of our author, "What, in the name of wonder," would our critics be at? The Baptisms mentioned Heb. 9. 10. mean (they say) not every kind of washing but those prescribed by the law for unclean persons."

What was this then to the case of the *priests who sinned through ignorance*? Why must they be brought in? To tell us, I suppose, it is one thing to dip and another to sprinkle and again another to pour!"

—This, to be sure, we never doubted, though we are far enough from believing that to baptize and to dip are synonymous terms and necessarily imply the same thing. Before we are convinced of this, reasons must be adduced more cogent and powerful than any we are yet acquainted with. However we very cheerfully leave others to judge for themselves; and shall only add "That if, after all that has been said, any still think it their indispensable duty to baptize by *immersion only*; let them by all means *thus* baptize: But then, we beseech them to forbear all severe censuring of those, who are *not dipt*. Let them not represent us as persons *unbaptized*----withdraw from our churches----refuse *communion with us* at the common ta-

ble of our Lord, upon so trifling a difference. This, surely, were to *dishonor* our sacred religion; and too naturally brings not only christian baptism, but christianity itself, into manifest *contempt*"——and, indeed, to us, "It seems not a little strange, that some, who profess to think *freely* in religion, should lay so *great stress* upon baptism by *dipping only*——That they make it to enter into the very essence of christian baptism——That they think it justifiable to break off from the churches of their fellow christians purely on this account---And can, without a smile, hear the few brethren of that way speaking of themselves as the *only baptized christians*; and looking upon the *whole christian world*, besides themselves, as to the *matter of christian baptism*, as being much upon a level with *Hottentots* and *Pagans*."——* If others can justify themselves in *such* measures, and on such grounds, we leave them to reap the fruits of their ritual zeal and tell the world at large, that, for our parts "We have not so learned Christ."

* Dipping not the only scriptural and primitive manner of Baptizing, p. 31 and 42.

C H A P. III.

*On the Nature, use and design of Baptism
whence it is argued that Believers and
their Children are the subjects of it.*

HITHERTO, in attempting to maintain our principles, (which every honest man has a right to do as well as he is able) we have been engaged in defence of our former opinion that Dipping and Baptism, are not terms of the same import, and consequently that the latter may be, where the former is not; how we have succeeded in our endeavours, belongs not to ourselves, but to others, to determine. We shall now proceed to consider what we think to be the nature, use and design of Baptism as represented by the Apostles. And as we very readily own, with Mr. Wilson, that “ It is an ordinance of Jesus Christ, and of standing use in the church of God, as appears from the nature of the institution when rightly understood;” so we shall lay before the reader our views of it as follows. In pursuit, then, of our design we shall proceed

ceed to examine the Apostle Peter's declaration Acts 2. 38, 39----where he says, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is to you and to your children and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

—That these words are to the purpose for which we cite them we shall endeavour to make appear in the following manner, shewing 1st, that children here intend their infant offspring—2. That the Gentiles are designed by that expression "all that are afar off" &c.—3dly. That by the promise is meant that illustrious covenant-promise made to Abraham, the father of the faithful whether Jews or Gentiles.—That by children we are understand their infant seed, appears to us for these reasons. *First*, because it seems to suit the design of the Apostle in comforting these distressed people, who now were under the greatest consternation, not only for themselves, but on account of the horrid imprecation they had uttered, saying "*His blood be upon us and our children.*" Matt. 27. 25.

Secondly,

Secondly, because the terms in which the promise is delivered, seem expressive of their immediate interest in it upon their parents evangelical repentance, “The promise *is* to you and your children.” Whereas, upon the principle of our opponents, the interpretation must be expressed after this manner “The promise *is* to you and *shall be* to your children when they believe.” Thus, Mr. Wilson says, “By children then I apprehend must be meant their offspring *when called.*” And a little further on he tells us; “Encouragement was given to their offspring, that with the same experience, or when called, they might look for the same privileges.”——But, surely, this was no more than he might have said concerning the children of Annas, or Caiaphas, the ungodly jewish priests, or of Pontius Pilate the unjust judge——What relief, therefore, this could minister unto the minds of people in their situation, who were under dreadful apprehensions upon the account of their former conduct and horrid imprecation, I say what comfort it could yield them in regard to the whole of their distress I cannot see.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, the Apostle seems evidently to mention their children as an additional argument to excite them to comply with his exhortation. "The promise is to you and to your children;" whereas if their children were no more concerned therein than heathens till they believed, I cannot see what weight it should add to his address. 2. By those "*afar off*" we think the Gentiles are intended, for the following reasons. *First*, because the description exactly suits the Apostle Paul's representation of them in opposition to the Jews, whom he describes as being *nigh*; speaking of Christ, he says,—"That he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to *you* which were *afar off*, and to *them* that were *nigh**." Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God"—Into this community of privileges the Gentiles were brought by the Gospel.---The personal ministry of Christ was confin'd, we know, amongst the Jews, but he preached these glad tidings unto them

* Ephesians 2nd.

them by his ministers, and we think his gracious proclamation was issued forth by Peter's voice speaking under the influence of his blessed spirit——We, therefore, think that exception in a certain review, of no weight, “ That the Gentiles could not be intended, because upon that supposition Peter must speak what he did *not understand*.” Might it not as well be argued that when Christ gave them his commission to preach the gospel to all nations, that only the Jews scattered about in all the world were the objects of that commission? As, we know, it was some time before they *understood* it in any other light, see Acts 10. 28.

Secondly, because all the Jews whether dwelling in the land of Judea or not, are represented as being *nigh*, in reference unto spiritual privileges which they had long enjoyed above all other people in the world, and, therefore, how any of them could be said to be *far off*, in the sense of scripture, is what I cannot comprehend. See Paul's description of Jews and Gentiles, Eph. 2. 11, to the end.

3. We shall now give our reasons why we conceive that the promise here mentioned refers to that illustrious gospel promise

H

mise

mise made to Abraham. We apprehend it must mean either the promise contained in the Abrahamic covenant, or the promise of the spirit, in his miraculous influences expressed in that of Joel. That it was not the latter, exclusively, without any reference to the former, appears to us, *First*, because the Apostle, we think, had intimated the accomplishment of that prophecy, in great part, in the extraordinary and miraculous effects of the holy spirit which fell upon them. Standing up to vindicate his brethren he says “ These are not drunken as ye suppose——But *this is that which was spoken by the Prophet Joel, &c.*” Which, he argues, was an attestation of the fact that Jesus Christ was raised from the dead and had fulfilled the promises made unto his Apostles (compare v. 32, 33. with Acts 1. 4. also John 14. 16, 17, 26---15. 26---16. 13, 14) And as we are told that Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law ---That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the spirit through faith (Gal. 3, 13, 14) so we think the Abrahamic covenant promise is here principally designed,
the

the blessings of which are secured to us by the death of Christ, and that therefore the Gentiles as well as Jews were now interested in all the privileges of the gospel dispensation, both as to the extraordinary as well as common influences of the holy spirit, the *former* so far and in such instances as Divine wisdom saw necessary; the *latter* as the common privilege of all the saints——and if infants are capable of being made meet for heaven, I suppose it will be granted that meetness (call it by what name you please) is the effect of the spirit's agency in accomplishing the purpose of God towards them; consequently their interest in the promise is a most encouraging circumstance:

Secondly, there is no evidence, I think, that all this multitude were endowed with the spirit in his miraculous influences, but a strong presumption to the contrary, for what we read just after, seems to describe them in no way different from that which was the honor and privilege of all believers in common——“ And they continued stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. And fear came upon every soul, and many wonders and signs

were done by the Apostles." But no notice is taken of this, in regard to the three thousand, which seems a plain intimation that it was not the common privilege of *all* that number. *Thirdly*, had the promise here, intended that of the spirit in his miraculous powers only, as it was to as many as the Lord our God should call, then none could have any evidence that they were called of God but such as were thus endowed. But there is no proof that this was the case in regard to all the Jews who believed should we even suppose, with Mr. Richards, that the Gentiles are not meant by those afar off. —The opinion that Mr. Wilson formed upon these words is somewhat remarkable. He cannot deny but they are of an *encouraging* nature, and he argues for it in this way, "Encouragement, says he, was given to their offspring, that with the same experience, or when called, they might look for the same privileges." Then let Mr. Richards, as Mr. Wilson is no more, shew us, if he can, that *all* the Jews were upon their being called, *so privileged*, if the promise here intends that of the spirit's *miraculous* powers only; which,

which, he says, it did*.——Upon these accounts, then, we reject the notion that the promise here refers to that of Joel only, or exclusively, and argue that it refers to the grand promise contained in the Abrahamic covenant: In this we are farther confirmed by the following reasons. ---*First*, because that covenant must have been disannulled upon the supposition that believers children were cast out; whereas we are told it was confirmed of God in Christ, and that the law could not make it void when it was introduced four hundred and thirty years after it was established; strange that it should make it void then, at its abrogation. 'Tis known that this promise was established with Isaac as a covenant, God saying, “I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant; and with his seed after him†.” And 'tis very observable what Paul says to the gentile christians at Galatia “Now we brethren as Isaac was, are the children of promise, and, if the promise ran to him and his seed, and we Gentiles be the children of the promise even as he was; the inference, I should think

* Review, page 30th.

† Gen. 17, 19.

think, is plain, and, upon this view, I only beg leave to observe, that nothing could be a greater comfort and encouragement unto these people as to the whole of their distress, for themselves and their children.

Secondly, because, as for the reasons above given, we judge that by those *afar off* the Gentiles are meant, and that the gift of the Holy Ghost does not here signify his miraculous powers merely, so we read that the blessing of Abraham is come upon both Jews and Gentiles. Gal. 3. That promise, then, as containing all the blessings of the gospel, of which believers and their seed were respectively capable, and to whom therefore with the utmost propriety it might be apply'd, is, we think, what the Apostle designs.—Therefore, although Mr. Wilson could not see how the promise could be claimed but by believers, we think it evident that believers could claim it for themselves and their infant offspring, and that upon the warrant of the Apostle, in the way, and on the grounds now pleaded for. We shall now proceed to examine those two famous places so often quoted, and with so much confidence, to support the practice

tice of dipping, and also to maintain the *allusion* of being buried with Christ in baptism by *immersion*, as necessary for *believers* to observe. The first is Rom. 6.

“ Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death; we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.”——Now the question before us is, What is the design of the Apostle in this place?——Is it to represent the *allusion* there is between the mode of baptism and the burial and resurrection of Christ? If so why not go through with the Apostle’s argument and as we are said to be *crucified with him*, use the sign of the *cross* also? Mr. R—— was very liberal in his reflexions on his opponents asserting that they had no more reason for their practice than the Papists for their *fooleries* (such is his language!)

guage !) We ask him then to tell us, if the Apostle is carrying on the allusion between the mode of baptism and the burial of Christ, why he does not follow up the comparison of believers conformity to Christ through all the circumstances adduced by him?—But, to us, it is evident that the Apostle is arguing on the nature of a believer's *union* to Christ, and hence proving that he is dead to sin, and alive unto God through Jesus Christ; it seems, therefore, most reasonable to conclude, according to the nature of the subject, that the Apostle's allusion "*buried with him by baptism into death,*" is to be referred to the *burial of the body of sin* called our old man which is crucified with Christ, v. 6, rather than to the manner of administering the ordinance of baptism by immersion;—surely we are equally engaged to this, whatever be the quantity of water used in our christian baptism? Nor could *rivers* or *seas*, effect this death unto sin *without union* to Christ. *That* being the *subject* the Apostle evidently handles, it seems to us a very *lessening* idea to bring down his argument to allude to the quantity of water used in Baptism, admitting we were *buried* in the river Jordan,

dan, or, if you will, *plunged* in the great South Sea.—From this view of the passage in its *connexion*, we are, therefore, fully of opinion with Dr. Owen who says “ There is not one word, nor one expression, that mentions any resemblance between dipping under water, and the death and burial of Christ, nor one word that mentions a resemblance between our rising out of the water and the resurrection of Christ. Our being *buried with him by baptism into death* (verse 4th) is our being *planted together in the likeness of his death* (verse 5th). Our being planted together in the likeness of his death, is not our being dip’d under water, but *the crucifying of the old man* (verse 6th). Our being raised up with Christ from the dead, is not our rising from under the water, but our walking in newness of life, by virtue of the resurrection of Christ.—1 Pet. 3, 21*.”

We pass on to consider that parallel place (Col. 2) which is likewise so often cited to prove that the Apostle alludes to immersion; but, to me, it appears very inconclusive, after the most impartial survey of the context, which alone can enable

* Dr. Owen on Infant Baptism and Dipping.

ble us to form a right judgment of the Apostle's argument. Paul exhorts the church at Colosse to "*Beware lest any man should spoil them through Philosophy* (viz. by attempting to mend their christianity with its unsanctified assistance, which would, in that view, be found only to mar it and prove in the end unprofitable) *and vain deceit* (he calls them also to take heed not to walk) *after the tradition of men*, (as to any instance of vain conversation, derived from their Pagan ancestors, or the fond conceits of Jewish superstition, but to avoid every appearance thereof, which was) *after the rudiments of the world and not after* (the mind and will of) *Christ*; (and unto this exhortation they had every reason to conform themselves from the consideration of the dignity of his character, and the glory of his person) *For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are compleat in him* (both as to personal acceptance and spiritual privileges) *who is the head of all principality and power. In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ. Buried with him in Baptism, &c.*

This

This whole passage taken in its connected sense (and without a due attention to scripture in its connexion, what hypothesis is so extravagant that may not be countenanced? But, keeping this in view, the place before us,) teaches us how perfectly believers are *complete* in Christ, in opposition to all that *Jewish* zealots might alledge when they urged the necessity of circumcision for their children and the observing of the Mosaic ritual; for the Apostle so argues as to evince that “Believers under the New Testament, have lost nothing, no privilege that was enjoyed by them under the old. Many things they have *gained*, and those of unspeakable excellency, but they have *lost* nothing at all. Whatever they had of *privilege* in any ordinance, that is continued; and whatever was of *burden* or bondage that is taken away*.”——In this view we think the Apostle’s arguments appear with all their force, and his reasoning most convincing, to establish the church at Colosse in the doctrine of the gospel, as gloriously answering every end of acceptance and privilege that is worthy of its exalted, its risen head!——That

I 2

circum-

* Dr. Owen on the Heb. vol. 2nd. p. 256.

circumcision was an ordinance of divine appointment is allowed on all hands ; that it was apply'd to the Infant seed of believers, both before and after the law of Moses, is equally certain; that it belonged unto that covenant of promise which the law did not make void is, therefore, we should think, a very natural conclusion ; and, added to all this, it may-be of some weight to observe that “ Divine institutions cease not without a Divine abrogation. Where they are once granted and erected by the authority of God, they can never cease without an *express act* of the *same authority* taking of them away. And this one consideration is enough to confirm the grant of the initial seal of the covenant unto the present seed of believers, which was once given by God himself, in the way of an institution, and never by him revoked*.” Upon the whole, it appears to us on the most attentive and impartial consideration of the above illustrious passages (viz. Rom. 6, and Col. 2) that nothing is there delivered, from which we can *certainly* infer that baptism was administered by *immersion*, much less that the ordinance

* Dr. Owen on Heb. vol. 3rd. chap. 7. p. 179.

nance is of such a nature as that it ought not to be administered to the infant seed of believers; but, on the contrary, very powerful reasons to convince us that their right unto the ordinance is according to the mind of Christ and his Apostles. The arguments adduced are submitted to the attention of the candid and impartial.--- Mr. Wilson puts in his exceptions, saying a few things which he judged might perplex the scheme he meant to oppose. I agree with him, however, that the "Circumcision made without hands intended the renewing influences of the Holy Ghost." But when speaking of the metaphor, buried with him in baptism, he says "This seemed much better to answer to immersion than sprinkling or pouring," 'tis certain he should first have proved that the Apostle by that term meant to refer to the administration of the ordinance. If he takes it for granted, there is no reason we should take his ipse dixit for proof.---Let us, however, hear how he further reasons upon this passage. This gentleman proceeds to inform us, "That as in the ordinance of the supper there is a believing memorial of Christ's love in his sufferings and death; so in Baptism,

Baptism, the faint, by an eye of faith, is called to attend to his condescension when imprisoned in the grave, and his glory as a conqueror in breaking the bands of death; in each of which he sustained the character of the surety of the covenant, and head of the body——And as the actions of breaking the bread, and pouring out the wine, are expressive of his agony and death; the immersion and rising of the person baptized, might refer to his burial and resurrection*,”——Whence, it seems, the Lord's supper is to be considered as a memorial of the sufferings and death of Christ, and baptism to represent his being imprisoned in the grave, and rising as a conqueror breaking the bands of death; from which we are taught to conclude that here are two christian ordinances appointed, not both of them to represent directly the same thing, but even more strange; the former to represent one half and the latter the other; accordingly, if our author's reasoning is legitimate, every time we receive the Lord's supper we should, I think, upon *this principle* also be *baptized*; for how can we shew forth his death with any comfort

comfort to our souls, or glory to God, unless we shew him forth as the *conqueror* of death? We only beg leave further to subjoin; that the Apostle seems, to us, very plainly to indicate that baptism succeeds circumcision, and is therefore the privilege of believers and their children under the gospel, as that was to Abraham and his offspring. Had not this been the case, we much wonder why he should mention circumcision at all when writing to *Gentile* converts, and arguing with them on the *subject of Baptism*.—But considering the *Jews*, as he elsewhere represents them, as *broken off* by their unbelief from all the privileges of the *Abrahamic covenant*, and the *Gentiles*, who were as the wild olive *grafted in*, it was natural for him to shew in what manner the privileges of that covenant, as administered under the gospel, are conferred upon them*. And, we think, if God intended their seed should be excluded, notice would have been taken of it by the Apostle, whereas his arguments appear to us quite conclusive that it was to be with the seed of believers as aforetime; Mr. W——n, therefore, was undoubtedly in

* Rom. 11, 15, 16, &c.

in the right when he said, " I thought if the Baptism of Infants under the gospel was to be argued from circumcision, the Apostle would certainly have given some *hint* of it " We think he has, and a very broad one too.—Let us now proceed to take into consideration, the *commission* given to the Apostles to baptize the nations, and also the representation that Paul gives us of the children of believing parents—Our antagonist seems confident *these scriptures* are not *for* us but against us ; let us then examine the truth of the matter so far as we are able to discern it. It will be proper, then, to begin with some considerations on what Mr. Richards has advanced to evince that children could not be included in the commission given to the Apostles to baptize all nations. He is by no means willing to allow that the term *disciples* was ever apply'd to *children*, no not to the children of the Jews themselves. " We never meet, says this writer, with the *most distant hint* that any of them ever thought that the word *disciples* could be apply'd to their infants." And adds, in a strain we are too often wont to hear, " Such flagrant abuse of words even the ancient
ancient

ancient Pharisees, it seems, had too much modesty and good sense to be guilty of *."

—Whether their *modesty* and *good sense* was greater than some other folks, or not, I believe, no way effects the question, and therefore I shall not dispute that matter. But that the Jews were wont to consider their *children*, and the children of Profelytes, as *disciples*; and that the infants of believers may be likewise so termed with propriety, we still imagine, notwithstanding our Author is pleased to term it "A droll and irrational sentiment"—Our antagonist, it seems, is a very warm opposer of the doctrine of inferences† and analogy; and we need not wonder at it; the reason is plain. His cause, in this matter, requires it.—However we think it perfectly consistent with good sense, and good doctrine too, though the former, be estimated by logical accuracy, and the latter be measured by scripture rule.—We argue, that children are included in that term, as it appears, from Acts 15. 10, compared with Acts 21. 21.—We are told in the context that "*Certain men which came down from Judea* (who it seems were of
K the

* See Review, p. 19.

† Page 28.

the sect of the Pharisees which believed, v. 5) *taught the brethren, and said, except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.* This principle, Paul and Barnabas warmly opposed, v. 2, and it was agreed that a meeting of the Apostles and Elders, should be held at Jerusalem, about this question; accordingly they came together for to consider of this matter, v. 6. The issue was that such a procedure was not according to the mind of God, as Peter argued, proving that the gentile converts were not first to be made Jews before they could become christians, but as the Jews themselves were delivered from the whole Mosaic œconomy, by the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, so it ill became them to think of bringing them into that state of bondage under which themselves were formerly held, seeing God put no difference, says he, between us, and them, purifying their hearts by faith, and, of course teaching us “That the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel*,” a truth which, Paul tells us, was

* See Eph. 3. 5, 6.

was revealed by God unto his holy Apostles. " Upon these principles, Peter cries out, Now, therefore, why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples.—Now the question being " Whether it was necessary that they should be circumcised after the *manner of Moses*," let deliberate men determine whether there be not so much as the most distant hint that infants are included in the term; especially when they consider too, that upon Paul's coming to Jerusalem on a future occasion, the brethren told him what the zealous Jews were informed of him, that he taught all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake *Moses*, *saying* that they ought not to *circumcise their children*, neither to walk after the customs."—We leave others then to decide upon what authority Mr. R—— asserts that " This text says not a word about the matter." I am still, however, of opinion that if we would learn the meaning of scripture, we must consult the connection, and compare one part of holy writ with another.

We pass on now to the Apostle's *commission* as recorded in Matt. 28. 19, and Mark 16. 15, 16---Our opponent dwells

much upon the necessity of making a due distinction between *Matbeteufate* and *Didaskontes*, and we also allow that a distinction may very properly be made; accordingly we render the words, as many do, “Go ye therefore disciple all nations, baptizing them, &c. teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you,” and we likewise admit that it was by preaching the gospel to the nations that they were to get unbelievers to the faith; and, further, we judge, that upon a *profession* hereof being made, *they were baptized, and their households* in consequence thereof. Accordingly there appears to us a striking propriety in this idea which we suppose the directions couched in the commission convey, and the Apostle’s practice confirms us herein. —Now whereas Mr. Richards so far approves of what Dr. *Doddridge* has said upon the passage in a note subjoin’d to his Family Expofitor, as to cite a *part* of what he says, we shall take the liberty to *add* what that gentleman has *omitted*. “I render the word *Matbeteufate*, profelyte, that it may be duly distinguished from *Didaskontes*, *teaching*, in the next verse, with which our version confounds it. The former seems to import

import instruction in the essentials of religion, which it was necessary adult persons should know and submit to, before they could regularly be admitted to baptism; the latter may relate to those more particular admonitions in regard to christian faith and practice, which were to be built upon that foundation"——adding also "*It is certain, that no argument can be drawn from hence to the prejudice of Infant Baptism*; for had Christ sent out these missionaries to propagate Judaism in the world, he might have used the same language "Go and proselyte all nations circumcising them in the name of the God of Israel, and teaching them to observe all that Moses commanded." I only beg leave to add what Dr. Guise also subjoins in a note on this passage. "It seems to me that *Disciple all nations*, relates to the whole design of Christ's commission for making disciples to him, and that *baptizing* and *teaching them*, are mentioned as particular branches of that general design, the order of which was to be determined by the circumstances of things: And these indeed made it necessary, that in discipling adult *Jews* and *Heathens*, they should be taught before they were baptized; but other circumstances

stances in the settled state of the gospel kingdom make it as necessary, that in discipling the children of believers, they should be first baptized and afterwards taught, as the children of Jews and Proselytes to their religion were first circumcised, and when they grew up were instructed in the faith of the God of Israel."——With these gentlemen I am willing to leave my cause so far as it relates to this passage under debate, being very well satisfied in what they jointly depose. Whoever prefers the interpretation given us, by Mr. M'Lean, in a certain *Review*, he is undoubtedly at liberty to follow his own judgment, only it is hoped he will be neighbourly and do as he would be done by.

It remains only to give our thoughts on a piece of information, which we never expected to have found in our Reviewer's performance.——We there read (page 22) that "As the Apostles never baptized any but such as were first made disciples by preaching the gospel to them; so neither did they ever teach men to obey the laws of Christ till they were baptized disciples."——This, it seems, is what our Author's distinction between the two words *Matbeteusate disciple*, and *Didakontes*

skontes teaching, comes to——No doubt he intended hereby to serve his *own* cause; be that as it may I am persuaded he has done *ours no harm*; for if none were the subjects of christian exhortation but *baptized disciples*, then I gather, even from my opponent's principles, that *children* were *baptized* and esteemed *disciples* also. We all know that the Apostle says, "Children obey your parents in the Lord." And again "Children obey your parents in all things, for this is well-pleasing unto the Lord."——I presume this is a christian exhortation, or an exhorting them to obey the commands of Christ, as we find these things written by the Apostle in his epistles to the *churches at Ephesus and Colosse*. I feel therefore, methinks, no small satisfaction that, following even the arguments of my antagonist, I find myself landed, with my brethren, on the *firm ground of Children's Baptism and Children's Discipleship* too!

We shall now bring in review that famous passage of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 7. 14, which Mr. Richards seems to think he has answered *effectually*, for he has published his criticism upon it, as a *note* with Mr. *Wilson's* remarks on the same place.

place. The words are, "*For the unbelieving husband is sanctified (by, or rather) to the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified to the husband, else were your children unclean, but now are they holy,*" or sanctified. 'Tis agreed that the Apostle set himself in this chapter to answer some questions which the church at Corinth had proposed to him; and, after determining some things needless here to repeat, proceeds to answer the question Whether a christian might dwell with an husband, or wife, who was an idolater? He tells them they may, without any fear of contracting guilt or dishonoring Christ by co-habiting with each other, agreeably to the relation subsisting between them previous to the christianity of either. For, as we are elsewhere told, "To the pure all things are pure" so may it be said in the present case, "The unbelieving husband is sanctified to the wife, &c." Thus the Apostle declares it lawful for them to cohabit together in these mixed cases, of idolatry and christianity; and then he proves it from the condition in which their offspring confessedly were, adding *Else* were your children*

* STEEL. Vid. Dr. Goodwin, vol. 2d, (p. 410) on Election.

children unclean, but now are they holy. Unless we admit this to be the case, that the former part of the verse is the Apostle's declaration respecting the matter wherein his advice was sought, and the latter his proof, (*ad hominem*,) his reasoning seems, at least, not very forcible, and his answer, we think, must appear redundant; containing more than was necessary for their information; for, surely, the Corinthians did not want to be told that the lawfulness of their dwelling together made their children legitimate? And I think it highly probable, from the manner in which the Apostle answers their question respecting the lawfulness of a christian's dwelling with an unbelieving husband or wife, that their *scruple arose* from their fears that the children of such marriage should be infected as they grew up with the unbelieving parents idolatry; as he encourages them to dwell together from the peradventure that if they were unwilling to depart, it might possibly issue in their conversion. (see v. 15, 16) In this also I am much confirmed from the consideration that Corinth being a considerable church when

L

the

Election. The same word, viz. *επιλ* is used chap. 5. 10.

the Apostle himself was personally amongst them, it is almost morally certain that there were some amongst them at that time, who had either an unbelieving wife, or husband, unless they were all *converted by couples, every husband and wife at the same time*; and as there is no reason to believe that this was the case, so it will follow that the mere circumstance of a believer's dwelling with an unbeliever must have happened even when the Apostle was amongst them; consequently they could be in no doubt as to this case simply considered. But, when, after they had dwelt together some years, and the unbelieving party continued in their idolatry, there is no wonder it should become a case of conscience with them for the reason above-mentioned, viz. lest their children should be infected with their unbelieving parent's idolatry as they grew up. In this view nothing could be more to the purpose than the Apostle's answer; surely your dwelling together is lawful, otherwise your children would be unclean, but this you know is not the case, for they, even as those descended from believing parents on both sides, are holy, " And as readily admitted to baptism

tism in all our churches as if both the parents were christians*”---But hold; perhaps we go on too fast. Our learned opponent has established a criticism, which he thinks sufficient to overturn the whole at once. “The Apostle, says he, as positively affirms that the unconverted parent is holy, as he does that the children are so.” Whence, he concludes, “If this holiness can give the children a right to baptism, it must also give the unbelieving parent a right to that ordinance.” But, to use our author’s phraseology, “Must Mr. Richards be taught at this time of day;” That the sense in which words are used must be learned from the subjects about which they are employed, and the respective objects to which they are referred? To affix the same idea to the same word, when it relates to different objects, is not to instruct but to confound—not to guide but to mislead. And this, we think, must be the case here upon the supposition that *sanctified* imports the same thing when spoken of the unbelieving parent, as when predicated of their children; for then the Apostle’s argument amounts to this. ’Tis

I. 2

lawful

* Dr. Doddridge *in loco*.

lawful for you to dwell together ; otherwise your children would be bastards. But surely there was no occasion to apply to an inspired Apostle to find out this discovery ? Yea who knoweth not such things as these ?——But understanding the word in the former case in reference to that holy end which marriage was designed to answer, then it declares the *relation sanctified* as a mean to the obtaining of that end. *The unbelieving husband is sanctified to the wife, &c.*——And Mr. Richards should have observed that the Apostle “ *Varies* the phrase when he comes to speak of the children, from what he had used when he spake of the unbelieving parent himself ; he is said but to be sanctified by or to the wife, but the children are said to be holy ; the former notes a passive kind of subserving to the holy use of another, or to an holy end, but this latter notes a holiness in themselves ; that but an instrumental, this a personal——He cannot be said to be personally holy, for he is supposed to be an unbeliever, and so to say he were holy, would be a contradiction, yet he is sanctified as the creatures are, to an holy end. But the children here are said to be holy ;
and

and this the Apostle did on purpose to shew that theirs is a further holiness than the fathers*.—The criticism of our Reviewer, in saying that if the holiness of the children gave a right to baptism; that of the unconverted parents must do the same, is, therefore, surely, far beneath his learning; for upon this principle we might argue that the *holiness* of *believers* is of the *same nature* with the holiness of the *temple* at Jerusalem, as the *same word* is used *concerning both*, see Acts 21. 28 ---“ hath polluted *Agion* *topon touton* this *holy place*”---compared with Eph. 2. 21——“ groweth unto, *Naon agion en Kurio* an *holy temple* in the Lord”——Our antagonist seems to triumph in his discovery, for he cries out “ If Mr. Carter observed this, it must be exceedingly strange that the glaring fallaciousness of the following assertion should have escaped his notice, viz. “ Nothing can be more apparent than the word holy [viz. as predicated of the children, for on that the argument there rests, p. 16] signifies persons who might be permitted to partake of the distinguishing rites of God’s people.” We did not overlook it, and *that*
our

* Dr. Goodwin ut supra. p. 405.

our Reviewer may observe, if he should please to peruse these papers also, *and yet his inference will not follow.* I shall only add, in the words of Dr. Goodwin, that “ If by holy, the Apostle had meant no more than that their children were legitimate, he had in this said no more than the civil laws then in force did ; for they pronounced the marriage lawful and their children no bastards. Now his answer surely is more than law ; it is gospel ; and this privilege here of holiness, more than the civil law afforded children ; for it is a gospel privilege, as the very terms imply. To me therefore it seems certain that *holiness* here must necessarily import a *privilege* which believers children had (besides that of legitimation) which others, the children of unbelievers have not, though lawfully begotten. *And what this should be other than this, to be esteemed holy through their parents covenant, let all the world shew me*.*”

* Dr. Goodwin *in loco*, 2d vol. of his works.

C H A P. IV.

Our Lord's declaration, concerning Children considered.—Thoughts on his coming to confirm the Promises made unto the Fathers. The Abrahamic and the Christian Covenant the same.—On our Lord's Baptism.

THAT believers and their infant-seed were considered by the Apostles as the heirs of promise, and subjects of the gospel kingdom, we have endeavoured to evince in the preceding chapter; that this was according to the mind of Christ, we shall attempt farther to make appear, from some considerations now to be adduced. In pursuit of this we shall consider the following passage, Mark 10. 13, &c.—
 “And they brought young children to him that he should touch them; and his disciples rebuked those that brought them; but when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, *Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them*

them not; for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them." That our Lord speaks here of the persons of *little children* I think is evident, if words can make any thing so. *This* the learned Dr. Gale himself does not deny——Mr. Wilson, indeed, says it appeared to him "That our Lord was speaking of the *temper*, and not merely of the *persons* of children." We shall consider that matter presently; let us first advert to the reasons why the disciples strove to hinder their being brought to Christ. This we are not told expressly, but circumstances seem to make it pretty evident. It appears from the sequel of the history that their minds were at this time much exercised with the thoughts of a *temporal* kingdom which they imagined their Master would set up in Judea, the privileges and immunities of which, they supposed and expected they should have a peculiar interest in. No wonder then that being filled with these imaginations they should set themselves to oppose such

as

as were for bringing infants to the Lord Jesus. But their heavenly Master, to shew how much he was *displeased* with them upon this occasion, *rebuked* them before all the people, countermanding their order, and said “ Suffer little children to come unto me——for *of such* is the kingdom of God.” i. e. the kingdom of God belongs to such; as if he had said; the kingdom which, I, by authority received from my Father, am come to set up in the world is of such a nature that infants and little ones are not excluded its benefits. I receive them *now*, and *never* mean the children of those who own my authority and believe my word should be *cast out*. And I further tell you, my disciples, that as these little ones are brought unto me purely for the purpose of receiving *spiritual* blessings; so, “ Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein.” Now *little children* are here declared to *receive* the kingdom of God; and if ’tis said that all who do receive it must receive it *as such*, I should suppose it means on the same ground, or *upon the same account*, viz. *The promise of God containing a free grant of*

M

the

the same. 'Tis not that believers infants are better by nature, or more wise than others, that they are thus dealt with; but the *gracious promise* of God engaging himself to be *a God unto his people and to their seed*, is *their* only title, and our only claim, in *their behalf*, unto an interest in the privileges of the gospel kingdom—— And I presume that this too, *viz.* The free promise of God in Christ, is *our only title* to, and *ground of hope* for, eternal life. Believers, therefore, receive the kingdom of God *as* little children, and those who found their claim upon any other support, had need look well to the matter, lest their whole foundation sink beneath its weight.——'Tis not their worthiness nor their works, their meekness nor their humility, that will be pleadable in their behalf, as giving them any right or claim hereunto: though we know that those, who receive the kingdom of God *as* a little child, will and must be humble, meek and lowly; for, if their works can give them no claim, they can have nothing whereof to be proud or boast. Yea *this view* of the kingdom will the most effectually instruct them in the doctrine, and impress upon them the nature of true
humility

humility and lowliness of mind ! It will
*“ Cast down imaginations, and every high
 thing that exalteth itself against the know-
 ledge of God, and bring into captivity every
 thought to the obedience of Christ.”*——

Thus the *receiving* the kingdom as a little
child well suits our Lord's declaration that
*“ Except ye be converted, and become
 as little children, ye shall not enter into
 the kingdom of heaven.”* For nothing
 can more effectually enforce humility than
 this view of the kingdom does, as it takes
 away all ground of confidence in our-
 selves, the root of pride, and bane of
 lowliness ; and teaches us to *glory in no-
 thing, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus
 Christ.* If any other view of the subject
 is more consonant to the nature of our
 Lord's argument, and more suited to the
 end and design of his exhortation, our
 opponent, if he can tell, may make it
 appear.

We shall now proceed to evince that
 our Lord does in fact speak of the *persons*
 of little children brought unto him by
 such as owned and acknowledged his autho-
 rity. Here I shall make no scruple of cit-
 ing the words of another, though the quota-
 tion will be of some length ; speaking of

infants right to baptism, the Author argues in the following manner: he endeavours to make it appear, " From our *Saviour's* own words, Mark 10. 14, Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God. And, John 3. 5, Except any one (*τις*) is born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." From these two passages put together, the right of infants to baptism may be clearly inferred. For, *in one*, they are declared actually to have a place in God's kingdom, or church; and yet into this kingdom or church, the *other*, as expressly says, None can be admitted without being baptized. The kingdom of God, in the gospel, denotes, either the *visible* church on earth; or the *invisible* one in heaven. Answerable to these, there is a two-fold *regeneration*, namely a being born again of water (i. e. baptized, which is therefore called the *washing of regeneration*, Tit. 3, 5) which admits into the *visible church*; and a being born again of the spirit (called the renewing of the Holy Ghost) which admits into *the invisible*. Now, in whichever of these senses the expression is

here

here taken, it strongly concludes for the baptism of infants. For

1. If, by the *kingdom of God*, be meant the *visible church* on earth; our Lord, by saying of *such is the kingdom*, declares that *infants* are to be considered as having a place in *this kingdom*, i. e. as being members of that *body, society, or church*, which he, as Messiah, came to rule and save. But, if they are to be considered as a part of *this kingdom*, or *visible church*, they are then to be baptized, or born again of water, for this is the only appointed rite of entering into it. Or

2. If, by the *kingdom of God*, we understand the *invisible church* in heaven; into *that* infants cannot enter, except they are *born again of the spirit*, i. e. regenerated, quickened, [as to their souls] and raised from the dead [as to their bodies]. But, if they are capable and proper subjects of a regeneration by the spirit, they must be also of baptism; for the *baptismal water* is nothing else but the appointed *token or emblem* of this regenerating *spirit*. Seeing then, that God grants them the thing *signified*, viz. the renewing of the Holy Ghost, it can never be thought his will, that the *sign or token* be denied them,

them, viz. the washing of regeneration, or Baptism. The argument, then, is conclusive, in whatever sense we take the kingdom of God*." We have seen, indeed, that "Some, to evade the force of this text, would suppose, that by the word *such*, Christ here means (not *such infants* as those he had in his arms, but) *such grown persons* as were *like those infants* in simplicity and innocence. But according to this interpretation, they will never be able to make out the force of our Saviour's *argument*. They represent our Saviour as saying, The kingdom of God is their's, who are harmless *like infants*; therefore suffer the infants to come to me. According to these men, our Saviour would have said the same thing, if men had brought him *lambs* or *doves*, "Suffer the *doves* to come to me, for of *such* is the kingdom of God, i. e. Suffer the *doves* to come to me; for, though the kingdom of God is not their's; yet it belongs to *such* as are *harmless as doves*." But it cannot be thought our Divine Saviour would talk and argue at this rate.

It

* See "The Baptism of Infants a reasonable Service, founded upon *Scripture*, and undoubted Apostolic Tradition." page 25---27.

It is plain then, he intended to say, that *such infants* as those in his arms belong'd to the kingdom of God. And thus our Saviour's argument appears to be very strong and conclusive, viz. "Since such infants as these have the kingdom of God for their's, and so have him for their God, let them be brought to me; it is fit I should take notice of them, and give them my blessing, as members of my Father's kingdom*"——Who then can say that *believer's children* are not to be considered as standing in relation to the church of God, or *deny* that *they* are a *part* of his kingdom and ought to be treated as such? "Is he the God of the *Jews only*? Is he not *also of the Gentiles*? A God in the same *manner*, in the same *latitude* and *extent*, to us, as he was to *them*? Yes, he is, undoubtedly, thus a God to *believing Gentiles also*. Accordingly, *Isaiah*, speaking of the *christian dispensation*, or the state of the church under *the Messiah*, says, that not only *believers* should be esteemed *the seed of the blessed of the Lord*, (or the *blessed seed of the Lord*) but also their offspring *together with*

* Vid. Notes on several texts of Scripture, by Joseph Hallett, jun. vol. 3d, page 322.

with them" Isa. 65. 23.—Agreeably hereunto we believe that when our Lord Jesus Christ came to confirm the promises made unto the fathers, the following, amongst the rest, was ratified and established, viz. " I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." That *this* received divine sanction as to all the believing sons of Abraham (Jews or Gentiles) and their seed, appears to us most plainly intimated by considering and comparing the following scriptures:—
" Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers: And that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy."* Here I beg leave just to observe, that he mentions our Lord Jesus Christ as the minister of the circumcision to confirm the promises made unto the fathers, and takes notice of the Gentiles interest in the truth of God herein as well as the Jews. And what is the great promise given unto the fathers, of whom circumcision was, is known to all. It ran in the following terms—
" I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee, in their

* Romans 15. 8 2, 10.

their generations, for an everlasting covenant; to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee." This was the covenant of circumcision that God gave to Abraham, and which, the Apostle says, was so confirmed of God in Christ, that the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, could not disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect*. And when Christ as the minister of the circumcision for the truth of God came to confirm the promises made unto the fathers, we find that the Gentiles, as well as Jews, are called upon to glorify God for his mercy!—In further confirmation of the truth here contended for, I beg leave to cite the words of the very learned Mr. Hallett. "The covenant made with Abraham, and with his seed, includes, and was design'd to extend to all believers. When God promised to be a God to Abraham, and to his seed, St. Paul assures us, that by Abraham's seed is meant all that shall imitate the faith and virtue of Abraham, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, Gal. 3. 7. Know ye therefore, that they who are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. The expression,

N it

* Gal. 3. 17.

it must be own'd, is figurative, and only means, that though *Gentile* believers are not by birth, the children of *Abraham*; yet in the gospel covenant, they are treated *as if they were Abraham's posterity*: they are admitted to all the privileges that were granted to his children: they are favour'd and regarded *as if they were* his seed; and therefore they are called *his seed*. The Apostle adds, ver. 16. Now to Abraham, and *to his seed*, were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, *as* [if he was speaking] *of many* [different kinds of seeds:] *but* [the expression is] *as* [if he spake] *of one* [seed only in the singular number, saying] *And to thy seed, which is Christ*. It is here exceedingly evident from these words themselves, that the promise, to which the Apostle, in this place, refers, is no other than that Gen. 17. 7. "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and *thy seed* after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." These words, *and to thy seed* are the very words which the Apostle quotes and comments upon. And no one without the greatest absurdity, can suppose, that the Apostle
here

here refers to any promise, in which those words, *And to thy seed*, are not expressly written.—From this expression of the promise, the Apostle well argues, that there were not *two* seeds of *Abraham*; but that he had but one seed in all. He had not one seed that was circumcised, and another seed that was uncircumcised; not one seed that was of the *law*, and another seed that was of *faith*: but he had ONE seed only, even all believers, whether they were circumcised or uncircumcised, whether they were his natural posterity or not. This one seed of Abraham, St. Paul says, was Christ; *And to thy seed, which is Christ*. Where it is evident, that St. Paul did not, and could not possibly mean the *single person* of Christ. For, dropping the thought of his inspiration, the Apostle had too much sense to argue, that because the word *seed* is of the *singular* number; therefore it must signify *one single person*, and no more. When therefore the Apostle says, that *Abraham's ONE seed is Christ*, he plainly understands the word Christ, as signifying, in this place, not only Christ the *head* but also his *whole body*, the church." Hence our Author argues " That the

N 2

promise

promise to Abraham and his seed was *originally intended* for the *christian* church, and is applicable to it, not by way of allegory, analogy, or parity of reason, but *directly* and *immediately**."——Such, then being the nature of the Abrahamic covenant, of which *circumcision* was the *seal*, or *token*, had that rite respected the land of Canaan only, with the *temporal* privileges thereto annexed, I ask how and in what sense Christ, as the minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, confirmed the promises made to the fathers? Mr. Richards, instead of answering our objection cast in his way, on this foundation, That as circumcision was the seal, or token, of the covenant of grace which God made with Abraham 430 years before the law, and which that law could not disannul, and as this token of the covenant was applied to Infants from that time, so the covenant being the same, the sign only being altered†, and that for
a rite

* Hallett's Notes, &c. vol. 3d, p. 287---290.

† Dr. Stennett, we are told (p. 27) in arguing against the notion of baptism's succeeding circumcision, mentions the case of the "Jewish converts in adhering to circumcision and baptism too." But, I apprehend, unless the Doctor could prove that this adherence was counte-

a rite more consonant to the gospel dispensation, we still plead an interest therein for believers and their infant-seed. I say, instead of answering this, he insinuates that I had so stated the case as that it was no objection of theirs; but herein he knew better, he understood my meaning very well, which any body may perceive who reads with attention the 24th and 25th pages of his Review;—but he has answered all, he thinks, when he tells us, “Baptism is a positive duty.” ’Tis true he has told us so, positively, more than once; yet that has no great weight

countenanced by the Apostles, as *necessary* to be observed, it will neither hurt our cause nor help his own. ’Tis well known that *Paul* and *Barnabas* earnestly opposed them in this matter [i. e. as to the *necessity* of it. Compare Acts 15. 1, 2, with Acts 21. 21] And, considering the prejudices of custom and education, it does not appear to us at all strange that the Jewish zealots should warmly contend that it was needful for the Gentiles to be circumcised as well as baptized, and trained up also after the customs of Moses, as they themselves likewise had been. The argument, therefore, that the Doctor has framed for the Apostles, does not hit the debate. They argued, Unless they were circumcised, after the manner of Moses, and trained up in the observance of his customs, they could not be saved; so that it was not circumcision that they pleaded for only, but *the whole ritual law*. Compare Acts 15. 1, 2— with verses 19 and 20, and chap. 21. 21.

weight with us, for he has also told us with his usual air, that "For a christian to look upon the Abrahamic covenant as the foundation of baptism, is altogether as ridiculous as it would have been for the ancient Jews to ground circumcision on the oblations of Cain and Abel*."---- We, surely, do not say that the Abrahamic covenant is the foundation of Baptism, considered as a New Testament rite, but we certainly refer to that covenant as expressly declaring the interest of the infant seed of believers in the covenant of grace† and thence we argue their right to baptism, *that* being *now* made the *token* of the covenant as *circumcision* was *heretofore*. Baptism, we own, is so far a *positive* precept that it depended wholly upon the *will* of the church's head whether to appoint *that*, or *any other external sign* to be the token of his covenant under the gospel; and we never so much as insinuated, what our very *unfair*, and *uncandid*, Reviewer tells the world we say, viz. "That our Lord found it *necessary* to substitute Baptism in the

* Page 28.

† Let the Reader carefully consult Rom. 4. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and compare it with Rom. 11, from v. 13, to the end, and both with the 17th chapter of Genesis.

the room of circumcision:" but that he was *pleased* to appoint the former as a rite more consonant to the nature of that dispensation, wherein we are washed with water by the word—Are *pleased*, and *necessary* synonymous terms? Why then did our Overlooker adopt the one for the other?—Mr. Richards says (p. 25) "I will beg leave just to ask Mr. Carter, Do the scriptures any where hold up the covenant of circumcision, as our rule in respect to Baptism? Or have they given us the least intimation that we are to take that for our direction in performing this positive duty? If the scriptures have any where intimated that Baptism is founded on the covenant of circumcision, or that that covenant is to be our directory, in administering Baptism, or in judging who are its proper subjects, let him shew us such an intimation."——I have obeyed his humble request, and if that gentleman chooses to commence my Reviewer a second time, I beg he will not overlook my piece in such haste as to mistake my words and misrepresent my meaning; this secured, he may produce his cause, and bring forth his reasons to controvert what is here advanced.

We

We shall close this chapter with a short view of our Lord's Baptism. Mr. Wilson tells us that "From the expression of his *coming out of* the water he concluded it was by immersion" (Scrip. M. p. 8) ---Mr. R----- speaking of the Baptism of the Eunuch, says "We do not plead that he was dipped merely because it is said that he went *into* the water;" ---so then, it seems though the expression going *into* the water is not sufficient to prove that the subject was put under it, yet *coming out of* it will do the business!! ---We still think however, notwithstanding the flourish of a certain divine, that we have full as much reason to conclude that our Lord went into the brink of the river for John to pour water upon him with his hand; although with his accustomed air, he leaves "The impartial world to judge, if it be not just as probable that John did require sponsors, and use extream unction, and the sign of the cross likewise at our Lord's Baptism" (Rev. p. 13). But, leaving that, we pass on to consider the reasons why our Lord was baptized; and here we rest satisfied in that which himself has assign'd, saying "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness."

teousness." Hereby the Redeemer justified John's Baptism as a righteous ordinance of God's appointment, declaring, by his submission to it, that John acted by Divine authority (see Mat. 21. 25, Luke 20. 4, also chap. 7. 29). Upon these grounds, we find no difficulty in agreeing with Mr. Wilson, that "Christ spoke as the head of the church and example of his people, when he said Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness": for, surely, we own it to be our duty to comply with whatever comes under the sanction of Divine authority.—The very learned *Witsius* observes that, "Our Lord Jesus would be baptized that he might confer authority upon John's Baptism—declare himself to be the head of the baptized, as well as of the circumcised—that he might have communion with each; who came, that of both, he might make one—that by his own example he might both commend and sanctify our baptism even as the other sacraments to which he subjected himself*;"
 —namely, circumcision and the pass-over for the time they were to continue, and the Lord's supper which he instituted
 O the

* Vid. Witsium. De vita Johan. Bap.

the same night in which he was betrayed, and left for the use and comfort of his church, till he should come, the second time, without sin unto salvation.

C H A P. V.

Testimonies of some of the Ancients of the first and second centuries after the Apostles, with Remarks on those Testimonies.

NOTwithstanding I declared my willingness to rest satisfied in the Protestant maxim, "The scriptures sufficiency," and with which my opponent owned himself "Quite pleased," professing he could not wish to meet me on a *fairer spot*; yet I am forced from this my beloved sanctuary, to walk for a while in the fields of antiquity, in order to see what I am to meet with there, whether friends or foes; should they prove of the latter sort, I own 'twill be a matter of surprise,

surprise, as I have always hitherto taken them for the former; and as Mr. Richards wishes to know *who* I mean by the *ancients*, the title of the chapter will inform him of their *age*. To those who have no acquaintance with these things, but what is derived from mere hear-say report, it may seem *strange* that men of learning should differ so widely on the subject, as each to put in his claim in vindication of sentiments *directly opposite*. Waving many reasons which might be adduced to render this *accountable*, we beg leave to observe, that the *modes of expression*, adopted by the ancients, have helped forward this wrangling business, each claiming that such expressions were to be interpreted according to his own favorite system.—Thus they frequently speak of the ordinance of baptism, in terms which, in our language, import *regeneration, sealing, initiation, &c.*—Of persons baptized, as being *regenerated, sealed, enlighten'd, initiated, sanctified, &c.* Having thus advertized the unlearned of these things, (for the *literati* want not our information about them,) we pass on to hear the report they make*.——Fore-

O 2

most

* The following quotations are taken chiefly from
Wall's

most in rank and not inferior in weight, we place the double testimony of the famous Justin Martyr who flourished within about *forty years* of the Apostles, who in his famous Apology* for the christians, presented to the Emperor *Antoninus Pius* in the fifteenth year of his reign, says----
 “ They who are persuaded and do believe those things which are taught by us are true, and do promise to live according to them, are directed first to pray and ask of
 God

Wall's History of Infant Baptism, and King's Enquiry into the Constitution, &c. of the primitive Church.

* This was to vindicate them before the Roman Emperor and the senate, from the wicked and unjust aspersions cast upon them by their cruel adversaries. It began in this manner. “ To the Emperor----I Justin the son of Priscus make my request and petition in behalf of those men (being myself one of 'em) who are unjustly hated and most injuriously treated by all mankind.”---Respecting which, and the good effect attending the same, we read “ In the fifteenth year of Antoninus's reign, Justin the Martyr published his first apology, and presented it unto the Emperor, to his adopted sons, and to the senate, [upon which we are told it was enacted that] If any one for the future shall molest the christians, and accuse them merely on account of their religion, let the person who is arraigned be discharged, though he be found to be a christian, and the accuser be punished according to the rigour of the law†.”

† *Eusebius's Eccles. Hist.* p. 55---*Univer. Hist.* (ancient part) vol. 13, p. 307----also *Mosheim's Eccles. Hist.* vol. 1, p. 129, 130, with note (x).

God, with fasting, the forgiveness of their former sins: and we also pray and fast together with them. Then we bring them to some place where there is water, and they are *regenerated*, after the same way as we were."——In another part of his apology he adds——“Several persons amongst us sixty or seventy years old, of both sexes who were *discipled* to Christ in their *childhood*, do remain uncorrupted,” viz. Notwithstanding all the persecutions they have endured, they still maintain their christian profession with integrity.——Here I beg leave to note, 1. That Justin considered baptism as a sign of regeneration, for I suppose 'twill not be imagined that this orthodox father thought it was regeneration itself, but rather looked upon it as

“ The sign
 “ Of washing them from guilt of sin to life
 “ Pure*.

2. That, therefore, *adult* persons were not to be baptized, who gave no *evidence of being born again*, for “ It is evidently a prostitution of the ordinance of baptism to administer it to any adult person, who
 does

* Milton P. L. 612.

does not make a credible profession of faith in Christ and subjection to the gospel. It is therefore the duty of those by whom baptism is to be administered, to make a *diligent* enquiry into the *character* of those whom they admit to it*."—— And all this Justin Martyr's words evidently imply. Yet

3. It will *not* hence follow that *none* are the subject of this ordinance but regenerated persons; but that no *adult* persons are so, but those who make a *credible profession of christianity*.

To the *second testimony* we produce from this great man, it is *objected*; "That being made disciples from their infancy may only refer to their having been early instructed in the principles of the christian religion"——To which I beg leave to answer; That it does not appear at all probable that Justin should take upon him in his Apology to the Emperor, to *inform* him that the *christians instructed their children in the principles which themselves believed*; this, I suppose, was no less *evidently known*, than it was *natural to be inferred*. Should it be replied, That the Apologist had to vindicate his brethren from the vile and horrible

* Wall, Doddridge, &c.

rible calumny that they lay under, from some wretches, who wickedly, as absurdly, alledged against them, that they did in their assemblies eat young children, &c. We grant such abominable things were said, and we think the vindication is sufficiently evident, when he seems plainly to intimate how they disposed of their little ones in their childhood. Moreover his mentioning "*Disciples of both sexes*" appears to us very remarkable; What need for being thus particular?—To me the following reason seems not without its weight. In the preceding reigns the christians had been dreadfully persecuted on account of their refusing to pay any worship to the pretended deities of the Gentiles, and as *herein* they agreed with the *Jews*, they were considered as a sect of people living after their manner, and are by the Roman historians so denominated, and considered as a branch of that pestilent sect*.—Now to evince that they were no sect of the Jews, those disturbers of the Government, Justin tells the Emperor that they had *disciples amongst them*
of

* See Univer. Hist. vol. 13, p. 217. 218, with note (w) also Tacitus's account in same vol. p. 17 and 18, last edit.

of both sexes from their childhood, which was a full declaration that they were a different people from what they were represented. And although he does not hereby accuse those people to the civil power, yet he plainly enough intimates that whatever misdemeanors or enormities might be found amongst *them*, it would be unjust to impute the same things to the *christians* who were a different people.—We only add, that the *word* here used by Justin to express their being *discipled* to Christ, is the *same* that is used by Matthew when reciting our Lord's command, "*Go disciple all nations*" *Ematheteusate*. We shall now bring forward the testimony of Irenæus, who wrote about *sixty* years (or very little more) after the Apostles, and who speaking of Christ, says, "He came to save all persons by himself: All, I mean, who by him are regenerated (i: e. baptized) unto God, Infants, and little ones, and children and youths and elder persons."——To this testimony it is objected that, "We have only a Latin translation of this work, and some critics have supposed this passage spurious: or, allowing it to be genuine, it will not be granted, that to be regenerate always in
his

his writings signifies baptized, nor is it certain how far the fathers extended the period of infancy." Perhaps so; but nevertheless *that argument* can be of no avail *here*, since this father distinguishes *Infants from little ones and children**. And as to the probability that it was in the *power* of any translator to *foist into the text* of his author *such a sentiment*, and palm it upon the church, is not easy for us to believe; nor can we see what reason there should be for it, seeing *Ruffinus* and *Jerome* both lived in the *third* century after the Apostles, when, (yea even a *century before*) our *opponents* allow that "Infant Baptism was practised by *Great Numbers* of the Fathers" at least. What end therefore they could possibly have in attempting such a thing I can't conceive; I can much easier apprehend what end such an exception to the testimony is designed to answer; and whoever think they have reasons cogent enough to induce 'em to reject it, I have nothing to say, only that I am not of their mind.—Next let us hear *Tertullian*, who became famous within about a hundred years after the Apostles; for though he so speaks as

P that

* Dodd. Lec. p. 519.

that our opponents infer he was an enemy to Infant Baptism, yet we bring forward his testimony, judging upon the whole that he will prove no contemptible witness on our side. Arguing in a certain place respecting Infant Baptism, he thus reasons; " Our Lord says, indeed, do not *forbid them* to come to me. Therefore let them come when they are *grown up*; [This to be sure is curious logic] let 'em come when they understand; when they are instructed whither it is they come: let 'em be made christians when they can know Christ [Now mark on what his reasoning turns] What need *their guiltless age* make such haste to the forgiveness of sins?—This, it should be observed, was spoken about the end of the *first* century after the Apostles; when, Mr. Richards affirms, none of the ancients ever *dreamed* of Infant Baptism. But if Tertullian was not *asleep* when he wrote this passage, I should think the practice certainly obtained, or he could never have attempted to argue as he here does. Of the force of his reasoning let others judge. 'Tis the *fact* we here enquire after.—We now pass on to hear the testimony of ORIGEN. In one of his treatises he thus speaks

speaks.—“ Besides this also let it be considered; what is the reason, that whereas the Baptism of the Church is given for the forgiveness of sins, Infants also by the usage of the Church are Baptized: when if there were nothing in Infants which wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of Baptism would be needless to them.”

Again, he says, “ Infants are baptized for the remission of sins. Of what sins? Or when have they sinned; Or how can any reason of the laver hold good in their case; but according to that sense before-mentioned; none is free from pollution, though his life be but the length of a day upon the earth.”

In another treatise he writes.—“ For this also it was that the church had from the Apostles a tradition, or order, to give baptism also to Infants. For they to whom the divine mysteries were committed, knew that there is in all persons the *natural* pollution of sin, which must be done away by water and the spirit.”——

This was only *ten years* after the time when my opponent says there was no such practice in the church as Infant Baptism! ——What, no such thing in any one church in all the world but about ten

years before this time, and yet now called the usage of the church received by tradition, or order from the Apostles?!! It concerns our antagonist then, with a witness, to invalidate this testimony; but, though this has been attempted, yet I believe it never was effected, nor ever will*.

I proceed to observe that it appears to me exceedingly probable that *opposition* to Infant Baptism took its *rise* from first questioning, and then arguing against original sin; Thus, Tertullian calls out "Why need their *guiltless age* make such haste" and Origen arguing for it, does it upon the ground of their being by nature in a state of depravity.—I say he does upon this ground, though not on this ground only; he mentions Apostolic tradition; and is his testimony of less weight because that word is vilely abused by the papists? Surely not at all. We know that Paul himself used a similar term in 2 Thess. 3. 6,---*paradosin, traditionem*. Certainly therefore, it might, at that time of day, be used in a sound and proper sense? For
Origen

* Vid. *Wall's Defence against Gale*, p. 372, &c. Also Sir *Peter King's Enquiry*, &c. part second, p. 45, 46.

Origen being born the year *eighty-five* after the Apostles, as he could not be ignorant whether he himself was baptized in his infancy, so it is highly probable he had no further than his own family to go for enquiry into the Apostles practice, his father suffering martyrdom in the 102 year after the Apostolic age*.

I have only one more testimony that I mean to bring forward, but 'tis that of a multitude which though not always a mark of truth, yet in this case, it seems, to me at least, not a little weighty.— In about the year 154 after the Apostles, a synod, or assembly of Bishops, was held at Carthage, in Africa, whereat were present *sixty-six* Bishops: the following question came before them; not whether infants were to be baptized, but, whether it was fit Baptism should be administered before two or three days were expired, for certain reasons, or whether it would not, upon the whole, be better to conform herein to the rule of circumcision and perform it accordingly on the eighth day? The person's name was *Fidus*; the answer he received we shall lay before our readers so far as may be necessary in
this

* Wall, Doddridge, &c.

this case, and which runs in the following remarkable manner——“ As far as pertains to the case of infants, who you say, ought not to be baptized within the second or third day after they are born, and think that the law of circumcision should be observed [as to the time of performing it] so that they should not be baptized and sanctified till the eighth day, it seems to every one in our council far otherwise; for to your opinion, in this matter, no one consented”——Thus have I informed Mr. R——— and the public, who I meant, when I said, that the sense and practice of the ancients appeared to me evidently on the side of Infant Baptism. He is pleased to say that the ancients of the two first ages never *dreamed* of such a thing; he may, if he pleases, tell us his *waking* thoughts upon some of these. As to the instance now before us, I beg leave to recite the words of Sir *Peter* (afterwards Lord Chancellor *King*.) “ Here is, says he, as formal a synodical decree for the Baptism of Infants as can possibly be expected; which being the judgment of a synod is more authentic and cogent than that of a private father; [viz. at the same time from the Apostolic age,]

age,] it being supposable, that a private father might write his own particular judgment and opinion, but the determination of a synod or council, denotes the *common practice* and usage of the *whole church*."——To which I would subjoin, nearly in the words of Mr. Wall, That since the Apostles lived, some of 'em, to the end of the first century, John at least, and had propagated the christian faith in so many countries, and whereas such a thing as the general baptizing of infants could not be established without the most public notoriety of the fact, it being a thing wherein the whole body of the people, poor and rich, pastors and laymen, men and women, were concerned, it seems incredible to suppose that had it not been the Apostles practice to baptize Infants, a whole council of sixty-six Bishops at the distance of about a century and a half from the Apostolic age should all of 'em stand up for an usage which the Apostles never enjoined by precept and practice!——Had this been the case, Fidus needed not to have brought the question before the assembly; surely, if Infant Baptism was not practised within the *first century* after the Apostles, as
Mr.

Mr. Richards affirms, and which was only *fifty-four, or five*, years before this assembly met, some of them would have known it, as no doubt some amongst them, at least, were men of years, and lived *within the time* Mr. R—— says *none of the ancients* ever dreamed of Infant Baptism! —Let impartial people think over the matter. I know, indeed, 'tis objected that “Cyprian (who was president of the above council) speaks also of infant communion in the Lord's supper, and consequently that the divine original of the latter may as well be argued from *him* as that of the former”——We own the objection would have some weight in *this* case if we went upon the *authority* of the Fathers as our foundation for Infant Baptism; but that is not our ground; we argue for Infant Baptism on the authority of the New Testament. The ancients we believe practised it, and we have adduced (as we think) some *proofs* that they did so, but we are not therefore bound to believe that *all* that the ancients practised had the *same divine warrant*, unless we could make it out that the church is infallible; and as this is not the case, it obliges us to reject whatever they may
from

from time to time adopt that has not the same foundation for its usage; upon this principle we discard the Cyprianic* inno-

Q vation

* *The Cyprianic innovation.*] For there is no mention made of it but by Cyprian, till the time of Innocent the first, above four hundred years after Christ, when it seems to have become a very common practice to give the Eucharist to infants, founded upon a mistaken interpretation of that text "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." John 6. 53. — I do not take upon me to say, that no other church but that of which Cyprian was Bishop had that custom, but that it by no means appears that the sixty-six Bishops assembled with him in this council were of that mind, or that it was a general thing; for 'tis not in that Epistle which relates the business above quoted, that Cyprian speaks of infant communion, but in his Book *De lapsis*.----- To assert, as Mr. Richards has done, that "Infant communion, giving the baptized milk and honey, &c. has the same antiquity with Infant Baptism," is, methinks, only fit for a man who expects from his readers a good deal of credit. We do say then, with Doctor Wall, "It is not true that this custom of giving infants the Eucharist was in the ancient church received either so early or so generally as the baptism of them was."----Mr. Richards, we think, delivered himself in too positive a manner in that case, as well as in some others, and we can't but think it was from too much haste, speaking before he duly attended to the other side. We beg leave to recommend to his impartial attention what Dr. Wall has written in his Hist. of Infant Baptism, in part I. ch. VI. § 10----and part II. ch. IX. § 15. 16, 17.---as also a pamphlet entitled a "Defence of Infant Baptism in point of Antiquity against the Exceptions of Dr. John Gill and others."

vation of giving the Lord's supper to infants, and cite this council as an *historical fact* in respect to Infant Baptism, as a testimony that it prevailed amongst the ancient fathers at that time, as we judge it had done before in the *preceding* century, and as we also firmly believe it did in the time of the *Apostles*.—Our opponent is at liberty to think otherwise, and to tell the public his judgment, if he thinks proper, in regard to all the testimonies here adduced, which we bring forward as our proof; that the sense and practice of the ancients lie on the side of Infant Baptism.

C H A P. VI.

A Review of some Scriptures and Arguments adduced by Mess. Richards and Wilson. The households of Lydia, the Jailer, and Stephanus considered. Text in 1 Peter 3. 20, 21, examined, &c. &c.

WE are often told that “ There is no scripture precedent for baptizing Infants.” But, whereas we read of Believers and their *households* being baptized, it concerns our opponents to *prove* that there was not one *Infant* in such families; accordingly this Mr. Wilson has attempted to evince, but with what degree of *evidence* we shall proceed to examine.—The first which falls under our consideration is that of *Lydia*, who (we read Acts 16. 15) was baptized and her household”——and whereas not one syllable is spoken concerning her family believing, we judge that her *household* was baptized *in consequence of her be-*
Q 2
lieving

believing in the Lord---Mr. W-----indeed, says, "I thought there could be no dispute whether *she* believed before she was baptized;" as if *that* made any part of the debate between us. We all know, I suppose, as well as the Baptists, that *adult* persons unbaptized, have no right to the ordinance till *they* make a *profession* of faith; what end therefore this remark could answer I know not, unless to countenance, what some people are pleased to represent as a very powerful argument, "Infants cannot believe, therefore Infants are not to be baptized"---whereas we never argue for their Baptism on that ground---"As to her household, (says he) what it consisted of, is not said; nor is any notice taken of her husband if she had any: all that appeared to me from a careful examination of the account was, that she was *not at home*, or in the place of her common residence, that she came to sell her purple, &c." p. 16---In the same strain Dr. Gill argued long ago, and received an answer which might have excused some folks from saying any thing upon this head, unless they could have advanced something more to the purpose. "As for Lydia it is not certain in what state

state of life she was" said Dr. Gill. "Now if so, (to join issue here) then she might be a *wife*, or a *widow*, and she might have *children*, yea *little children*. Nor is it rational to think, that she would have *kept house*, as she did at *Philippi*, where she had her family with her, and leave her children at *Thyatira*, from whence she came; but not as a travelling pedlar to sell her purple at the fair, which is all fiction; for, could she not be a *seller of purple*, and yet a *shopkeeper*, as she plainly was an *housekeeper*?—It is said indeed that she was a woman of *Thyatira*. But to argue and conclude from hence that *this* city and not *Philippi* was now the place of her usual residence and stated abode: This way of reasoning [though used by Mr. Wilson and many before him, on the same side] is *false criticism*. For persons are said in *scripture*, to be of *such*, or *such* a place, to denote the place where they were *born* or *brought up*, the place from whence they came, and to which they originally belonged; though they had removed their habitation, and settled in some other town or country. Thus, for instance, *Mnason*, an old disciple, is said to be of *Cyprus*; and yet he lived

lived and kept house at *Jerusalem*. And thus again (to mention a most illustrious instance) our blessed Saviour himself is commonly called *Jesus of Nazareth*; [the very inscription upon his cross Joh. 19. 19] though leaving *Nazareth* where he had been brought up, he came and dwelt at *Capernaum*. Therefore laying all circumstances together, there is not the least ground to conclude any other, but that *Philippi* was the place of her settled habitation, at the time of *Lydia's* embracing the christian faith in that city; in consequence of which not only she herself, but her household also was baptized, though not a syllable is said of her household believing——After all, though we insist upon it, that there is no evidence, and justly demand a proof, that *all* the members of her family were adult persons, or believers; yet that there were *none* such besides herself, we neither presume to say, nor are obliged by our argument to maintain*.”——However, Mr. Wilson will have it that all her family were converted by the Apostles ministry, and baptized with their mistress, and tells

us

* *Pædobaptism defended against Dr. Gill, &c.* part 2nd, page 33, and 34.

us he was *greatly* confirmed in this because the persons the Apostle found in *Lydia's* house when he entered into it [viz. after the Jailer had been baptized and his household, for this is mentioned first] are called *brethren*, and were *comforted* by him; which cannot be said of infants"——As if the *brethren* that were in the *neighbourhood* could not have a *meeting* at *Lydia's house* before the Apostle's *departure* from them; which, in fact, appears most evidently to have been the case. (see Acts 16. 40, and 17 and 1st verse)——What *great* effect upon the mind do *shadows sometimes* produce! ——But we are further told that "The account of the conversion of the Jailer and his family also helped to confirm our opponent that *Lydia's* household were all believers"——But supposing it could be *proved* there were no children in *his* family, would that be an argument that there were none in *Lydia's*?——We are, however, by no means convinced this was the case even as to the Jailer's household; for though we read that, "They spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house" yet it by no means necessarily imports that there were
no

no children in that number, but that his *whole* family was got together upon this solemn occasion, having been dreadfully alarmed out of their sleep by the late earthquake. But is it not said, "He rejoiced believing in God with all his house?" We allow 'tis so said in our English Testament, but in no wise think that it *must* be so rendered, but rather "He having believed in God, rejoiced, &c." [see *Henry, Guise, &c.*] Namely, on consideration of that happy state of christian privileges they were now placed in, according to what he had been taught when he was told in answer to his question, What shall I do? &c. "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shall be saved and thy house." By which he intends (I think) their "Being brought under the only means of salvation."* Thus, our Lord said upon the conversion of Zaccheus, "This day is salvation come to this house." (see also Acts 28. 28)--- In this view the Jailer had cause enough to *rejoice in and with all his house*, who were lately in so very different a situation. However we do not say there were *none* in his house that believed but himself, but

* *Leigh's Annotations in loco.*

but argue that it *cannot be proved* he had *no children*; and whereas it is expressly said that he was baptized, and ALL HIS straightway" it strongly intimates that *their baptism* followed upon *his believing*, at least that there were *some* such in that number.—I might now add, but that I think it a matter of very little *importance* whether they were *dipped* or not, that it seems highly improbable that the Apostle or his companion Silas, should *plunge* them at midnight, especially as we are told "That he took them the *same* hour of the night and *washed their stripes*, and was baptized he and all his straightway." Moreover it was done in the house too, which, although we allow it possible there might be water enough to plunge them, yet it does not seem probable that the Baptizer with his *stripes just washed* was fit to go into the water deep enough for that purpose. If any should say that they were *immersed* with, or without, any going into the water but the persons baptized, I have nothing to say, only that I do not feel myself obliged to believe that they were in fact so immersed till they can find themselves able to *prove it*.—Mr. Wilson mentioning the *household of Stephanus*,

R

phanus which Paul baptized when he *first* introduced the Gospel into Achaia, and *upon which account* he evidently calls them the *first-fruits of Achaia*, maintains there could be no Infants there, because Paul tells us [when he wrote his epistle to the Corinthians, which it should be remarked was at least *several years after*] that they had addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints——As if that imply'd that because they *now* were known to do this eminently, that therefore there could be no children when the head of the family first believed, and probably several others with him.——Till some better argument, therefore, than this can be found to prove that the household of Stephanus, *when baptized*, were *all believers*, we think ourselves justified in withholding our assent to the opinion of our opponents; and whereas households are known to comprehend the whole family, and that children most commonly make no inconsiderable part thereof, we think the weight of the matter, when all circumstances are considered, *lies wholly on our side*.——

There is only one instance more that I shall take notice of, that is urged by Mr.

W——

W—— in favor of immersion and against Infant Baptism. 'Tis the last in his Manual, and he calls it “ The last place of scripture, which speaks directly of the nature and meaning of the ordinance of Baptism.” We shall cite the passage at length, and take a view of its connexion, 1 Pet. 3. 18, 19, 20, 21——*For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, (the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God) being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit: By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison* [souls now in hell suffering the reward of their evil deeds. Vid. Matt. 5. 25. Luke 12. 58*] *which sometime were disobedient when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was preparing* [viz. the space of one hundred and twenty years, during which time, Noah, a preacher of righteousness, warned the guilty world of the threatened deluge; and this he did under the influences of the Holy Ghost, (called here the spirit by which Christ preached unto them, and) who taught Noah to believe in, and to fear the Lord, and accordingly at his command he prepared the ark] *wherein few, that is, eight*
R 2 *souls*

* φυλακη the word here used.

souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto [or more properly An Antitype to which; that is, the thing which corresponds, not with the water, but with the ark] even Baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.*”——Mr. Wilson, in arguing upon this passage talks about “ Noah and the creatures being *buried* in the ark, and especially, says he, this was the case, when the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened, and they in the midst of that deluge, which destroyed all the world. This appeared to me to answer to *immersion* in Baptism; and I could not think the Holy Ghost would refer us to the water of a flood, as a *type* of a little quantity made use of when poured or sprinkled on the face of an infant.”——But this gentleman should have *proved* that the Holy Ghost referred to the *water* of the *flood*, and the *manner of baptizing*, as *correspondent* thereunto; whereas the matter appears quite otherwise, as hinted above, and, as we judge, may be farther corro-

* Dr. Doddridge.

corroborated, from the following view of the passage in its connexion. The design, and import of the Apostle's words seem to be this. Christ, by his spirit, preached unto the old world, and gave them warning of the destruction that awaited them (if they persisted in their evil courses) 120 years before the threatened deluge came. Such as believed, made use of the means appointed of God to preserve them from ruin; the number was small indeed, only eight persons, Noah and his family; but, *few* as they were, they were not forgotten of God, but sheltered in the evil time, from the destruction in which the whole world besides was involved. And thus under the gospel, things, in some sort, bear a striking similarity, insomuch that, as an Antitype to this, Baptism does also now save us. For whereas Christ declares unto all by the preaching of his word and spirit that certain destruction awaits the ungodly who continue in their sins, and points out unto us by his gospel, the only means ordained of God as a security from the impending storm of his wrath, "Which as an overflowing flood shall sweep away the wicked from the earth;" our belief of these things we
 avow

avow and declare, and shew our readiness to come under the security thus provided, by professing our faith in the gospel dispensation, and coming with our families unto the ordinance of baptism, which gives an entrance into the church, which he has promised to preserve, though tossed on the waves and billows of various trials in this world. And to prevent any *undue* confidence in, or dependance upon, the ordinance of baptism, he seems to remind us that if we remained still in our sins, it would be of no avail to us as pertaining to the conscience, or securing our salvation. For, it is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but, the answer of a good conscience towards God, that we ought principally to regard. This appears to us to be the Apostle's meaning. Let others judge for themselves. But perhaps it will be urged " Infants cannot make this answer of a *good* conscience; for that means, an enlightened, renewed conscience." We grant it; though it will not hence follow " Therefore Infants are not to be baptized," as our opponents urge. In reply to which objection of theirs we may add in the words of Dr. Whitby. " St. Paul also says that the
true

true circumcision before God is not the *outward circumcision of the flesh*, but the *internal circumcision of the heart and spirit*. But will any one here argue That the Jewish infants for want of this were not to be admitted into covenant with God by circumcision? And yet the argument is plainly parallel: The answer of a good conscience is required that the baptism may be salutary; therefore they only are to be baptized, who can make this answer; and the inward circumcision of the heart is required, as the only acceptable circumcision in the sight of God; therefore they only are to be circumcised who have this inward circumcision of the heart."——Upon the whole, therefore, we judge that this passage suggests a very striking *caution*, to adult persons, not to make *too much* of the ordinance, and lays a foundation for us to exhort children not to depend upon it *when grown up*, as being of any avail to them *then*, without the answer of a good conscience towards God, witnessing that their faith is unfeigned and their obedience sincere.

We

We shall now take our final leave of Mr. Wilson's Manual, and review some arguments of Mr. Richards's which have, hitherto, been omitted. This gentleman, I find, objects to our speaking of Baptism as the *seal* of the covenant. He will allow, indeed, that circumcision was to Abraham a seal of the righteousness of faith, but denies it was so to his descendants." But upon this, he ought, I think, to have explained himself a little more particularly.—If he intends thereby to insinuate that circumcision was not a *seal of the covenant* to any but Abraham, we can by no means accede to his judgment.—God in a Way of Grace, deals with his people in a covenant manner, through Christ, their *surety*; (and be it always observed the Abrahamic covenant was confirmed of God in Christ*) Accordingly, those institutions which he has appointed to be used by his people, as the *token* or *sign* of the covenant, may, as in the case of circumcision, be called the *seal* of the covenant. For, I presume, when in Abraham's case it is called a seal of the righteousness of faith that he had being uncircumcised, it intimates very plainly

* Gal. 3. 17.

plainly, that it was the *seal* of *that* covenant through which Abraham obtained righteousness and life, being justified by faith. Dr. *Doddridge's* remarks on this passage deserve our notice.—“ Seal of the righteousness of faith.” This (says he) seems an uncontestable proof that circumcision was a *seal of the covenant of Grace*, and not merely of temporal promises; and consequently obviates the most considerable objection that hath ever been made against Infant Baptism”*——The seal of that covenant was once given to children, and as their right was never *disannulled* that we can find, directly or indirectly, we therefore argue for its continuance under the Gospel. And I further beg leave to observe that the token†, or seal of the covenant which God has instituted, being apply'd to the subject, can be no infallible evidence of the persons interest in the blessings of the Gospel beyond their infant state (for that is not the subject of revelation, being known to God alone, and not of one person in respect to another) and, therefore, when we speak of it as a *seal*, we do not mean to affix

S *that*

* Fam: Expos: on Rom. 4. 11.

† Gen. 17. 11.

that notion; but only that God, giving unto his people an instituted sign of his covenant, we apply this sign, or seal, unto Believers and their seed, because we think it evident that the scripture warrants us to consider them as the heirs of promise.—

If 'tis said that many of them turn out wicked and rebellious, the same might be said of Abraham's seed, to whom yet the token of the covenant was apply'd. And what then, shall their unbelief make the faith of God of none effect? By no means. God is still faithful to all his promises, though they should be as reprobates; and, I would ask, "Do those who are baptized when *adult* always answer the expectations of the people? And, if not, I further ask what it was that gave them a right to the ordinance? If 'tis said a charitable hope that they were the subjects of the covenant of Grace, upon that profession they made of faith in Christ. We allow that these are the terms on which the scripture warrants us to administer that ordinance to adult persons, because there is no other way whereby we ought to judge concerning them; but in the case of Infants, God's promise to his people and their seed is our directory, and of that faith we
make

make our prefeſſion when we come with our little ones before the Lord.

In my ſhort ſtriſtures I mentioned that paſſage in Jeremiah, “ Their children ſhall be as aforetime,” as an intimation that in Goſpel times, the ſeed of believers ſhould have the token of the Covenant of Grace; for we can in no wiſe think our Lord Jeſus Chriſt would abridge them of this privilege, as they had before enjoyed it under the Abrahamic covenant. I gave my reaſons in a note ſubjoined; but Mr. Richards inſtead of ſhewing their inconcluſivenefs tells his friend, “ That paſſage is no more to the purpoſe than the firſt verſe in Genefis*.” I only ſay ’twas well he was writing to a *friend*, for perhaps every body would not have liked to have had their judgment made ſo free with. But poſſibly, he could rely upon his friend to take for granted whatever he ſhould pleaſe to advance——As we are not of the ſame mind, we ſtill claim that text as our own, in the caſe before us, till Mr. R—— ſhall be pleaſed to remove it out of the way, by anſwering our arguments.——When they aſk us, where is it ſaid, let your children be baptized? We

S 2

referred

* P. 29.

referred them for answer to the arguments we had adduced ; to which we now add what is here subjoined, whence we conclude it is according to the tenor of *the whole New Testament*.——We then in our turn asked “ Where do we read that any children of christian parents were baptized by the Apostles after they came to age.” Our opponent confesses “ No where that I know of.” And gives his reason for it thus ;” “ The Apostles took no notice of it, however frequent it might have occurred [but observe that is not *proving it did occur*] because they well knew that the gospel leaves no room for that Pharisaic plea, We have Abraham to our father, nor allows that the seed of believers have any right to Baptism more than other children.”——Our reasons for thinking otherwise we have given. But what means our Author by saying that was a Pharisaic plea?——Was it no privilege to the Jews that they were the sons of Abraham? How came the Apostles then to remind them of their privileges on that very account*?” What, because the Pharisees boasted in it in a way that the scriptures never authorized them

* Acts 3. 25, 26. Rom. 3. 1, 2, 3.

them to do, was it therefore no privilege?
 —If Mr. Richards's answer will *serve* his friend, 'twill not *satisfy* us; till he can say something further, therefore, on the subject we don't think he has got rid of the objection; so far is it from confirming his cause, as he is pleased to insinuate.—Our Reviewer thought proper to represent how *charitable* he is in respect to children; and, as I think it is a pity to fall out with him when he touches upon *such* a subject, I could willingly leave him in the full possession of his creed undisturbed, frankly confessing that *what the scripture has not told me I do not pretend to know*. But, whereas he thought good to inform us that “ He views the dying Infants of Infidels entirely in the same situation, as to the *hope* of future bliss, with those of the most eminent christians,” I think, if christian parents have *any hope* concerning them, he ought to have told us on what *that hope* is founded. Dr. Gale, indeed, says “ *If there be any mercy in God—all Infants who could never offend him shall assuredly be saved.*” If this is the argument of our antagonist also, we say to him in the words of Dr. Wall, “ Christ has told us,
 to

to whom his word is come, what *we ourselves* are to expect. Concerning those to whom it never came, whoever busily enquires of him; *And what shall these men do?* Or, what shall become of them? does in effect receive from him this answer: *What is that to thee?* He has said in general; The servant that knew not his Master's will, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. And more than that he has not told us of their fate; and of their children nothing at all. He will, we need not fear, deal with all men, adult and infants, according to rules of justice and equity. But if a man, a worm, will not trust him with the ordering of those rules; but will demand beforehand, what he will do with such, and what with such; *He giveth not account of any of his matters.* A modest and humble speculation about such things may be useful; or, however, excusable. But to talk and determine after this arrogant manner, *If there be any mercy in God*, he will do so with these, and so with those; is good for nothing, but to create in us an abhorrence of the bold presumption of the
deter-

determiner*”—Mr. *Wilson* was (as becomes every christian) much more modest when he said he could find no *scripture* assurance of the salvation of *all* Infants. And yet *he* does not, any more than *we*, condemn them. God forbid! No: but leaves them to the just judge, who will do nothing but what is right†.

I had argued in my short strictures (p. 23 and 24) that baptism once administered, where a solemn profession of faith is made (by which I intended a scriptural acknowledgement of the doctrine of the Trinity) whether in the Church of England, or amongst Protestant Dissenters, though we allow some circumstances attending its administration were not duly observed, yet, on that account, we ought not, (as we apprehend) to declare their baptism to be null or void. Instead of such an answer as became a *fair* antagonist, the absurd nonsense of baptizing Bells is introduced, and the matter dismissed without one word of reply. However, we shall take this opportunity to corroborate our sentiments on that head, by reciting the words of an author whom
we

* Dr. Wall's Defence, page 249, 257.

† Scrip. Manual, page 10.

we have several times quoted. He puts the question thus, "Is baptism to be *repeated* if it have been received by those who were not the proper subjects of it?" and answers, "It seems it *should not*; since it is evident that when persons have been cast out of the christian church for their immoralities, the Apostle in the directions he gives concerning their admission on repentance, does not direct their being *re-baptized*; nor does Peter hint any thing of that kind to Simon Magus, and perhaps had the contrary principle been admitted and encouraged in Scripture difficulties might have arisen, which it was best to avoid, and too *great a stress* have been laid on what is *merely ritual*.*"

I know not that I have omitted any thing of weight, or consequence, in our Reviewer's performance, nor yet in Mr. Wilson's. Many things more, I know, might have been said, and if I had more leisure, and a greater inclination for polemical debates, I might have protracted it to a much greater length. However, before we conclude, we shall take the liberty to offer the following things to the consideration of Mr. Richards, as well as to the candid

* Dodd. Lec. page 523.

did and impartial attention of every serious reader.

1. As it is asserted there cannot be any such thing as baptism without the immersion of the whole body, We call upon him to *prove* that it was *always* so administered in every instance recorded of baptism in the New Testament.

2. If Baptism was always administered by immersion, as our antagonist contends, and that Infants were excluded from that ordinance, by the Apostles and their successors, during a whole century from the Apostolic Age without any exception, we think it strange that no account of such a Christian church is to be met with in that time; and we do challenge our opponent to prove that there was any one church of Christ so existing in any part of the world within the first *four hundred* years after Christ. If there was a church of believers who were *all* baptized at *adult* years upon their own personal profession of faith, and *whose children were not* in their infancy admitted to the ordinance, let him produce such an instance if he can.

3. If Baptism, considered as a religious rite, does in its nature represent the *burial*

T

and

and *resurrection* of Christ, as our opponent argues, we ask when it took that signification? Especially seeing *John* and the *Apostles* baptized so many thousands before it was so much as known that Christ should suffer and rise from the dead.

4. If there is *one uniform idea* that will apply to baptism from its first institution *at all times*, and in all circumstances, and that of *cleansing* and *purification*, to which there is *certainly* a most evident allusion in *many places*, agree hereunto, We ask why so much *stress* should be laid upon the pretended allusion to the *burial* and *resurrection* of Christ? Especially, seeing should we even admit there is such an allusion sometimes made, it must be confessed 'tis by no means the *most common* or frequent *allusion* that we meet with in the New Testament.

5. If there is no baptism but by immersion, it will follow that no persons who were not immersed in water ever were or could be members of a christian church; or else it must be allowed that churches may be constituted without the ordinance of Baptism. If the principles contained in the *former* part of this sentence are *avowed*, we are ready to own, that

that when they are *proved*, it will in good earnest concern us to look to ourselves. And if the latter should be admitted, I ask wherein consists the necessity, or importance, of *dipping*, or why it should be made a term of communion, as it is by many?

6. If the infants of believing parents were formerly the subjects of a rite expressive of their separation unto God, whereby they were esteemed an holy people, as distinguished from others, who were not of the visible church; We then call upon our opponent to shew us where our Lord *prohibits* believers children from any similar privilege under the New Testament? Let him point out to us such a prohibition and we will cease to put in our claim for Infant Baptism. Till then, we think there is some weight in what Dr. *Stillingfleet* has advanced, when he says, "It is an evidence, that Infants are not to be excluded from baptism, because there is *no divine law* which doth *prohibit* their admission into the church by it; for, this is the *negative* of a law; and if it had been Christ's intention to have *excluded any* from admission into the church, *who were admitted before*,

as infants were, there must have been some *positive law*, whereby such an intention of Christ should have been expressed; For, nothing can make that unlawful, which was a duty before, but a *direct and express prohibition* from the legislator himself, who alone hath power to rescind, as well as to make laws. And therefore, Antipedobaptists must, instead of requiring a positive command for baptizing Infants, themselves produce an *express prohibition* excluding them*."——"Till that can be made appear, submitting the weight of our arguments to the decision of others, we say, in direct opposition to our antagonist, that (we are fully convinced) Infant Baptism is warranted by Jesus Christ.

Others are heartily welcome to differ from us; but then they ought to do it *charitably*, and leave us in as quiet possession of our principles as we are willing to grant to them. 'Tis my full purpose never to dip my pen in this controversy any more; yet, if I am convinced of any error, I hope I shall never be backward to retract upon such conviction.

If any notice should be taken of this, I shall not hold myself bound to make any
reply

* Irenicum, p. 7, 8, edit. 2nd.

reply, unless its author should write fairly, and in a spirit and temper becoming a man who wishes to do as he would be done by: *To think for himself and let another do the same.*

T H E E N D.

C O R R I G E N D A.

- Page 8. line 6. from the bottom, for *however* read *whenever*.
P. 9. l. 2. from the top, after *Antagonist* put a comma instead of a period.
P. 32. l. 3. from the bottom, Paul's *Expression*.
Ditto. l. 2. instead of *And* read *But*.
P. 60. l. 11. for *get* read *begets*.
P. 64. l. 7. for *set* read *sets*.
P. 67. last line. after *argument*, read (on the principles of our Antagonist.)
P. 80. l. 18. for *he* read *the Apostle*.

18 AP 68

